



The Philatelic Communicator

Quarterly Journal of
Writers Unit 30, American Philatelic Society.

Volume 27, Number 1, Whole Number 103. First Quarter 1994.

So, You Want to Do a Philatelic Catalog?

By Bob Rawlins

I was more than a little surprised when Ken Lawrence sent me a card asking me to write an article on "how to" prepare a philatelic catalog. Although I am involved with an extensive revision of the *USCS Postmark Catalog*, I told him, when we met at STaMpsHOW, that I've compiled and edited only one catalog.

That's more than most people have done, he countered, and so I agreed to give it a shot. However, realizing that doing something but one time, be it bungee jumping, sky diving, or driving a bus does not make one an expert, I will simply relate my experience and let the reader draw his or her own conclusions on researching and editing a catalog.

Without question, members of WU30 are thoroughly familiar with any number of stamp catalogs, and I am not about to step into that swamp. However, should a WU30

member of a specialty society foresee the need for a compilation of data, *i.e.*, a catalog, read on, this discussion could prove of help.

My first involvement of any sort with catalog preparation was for the Universal Ship Cancellation Society (USCS) whose members are, or were, mostly ship postmark collectors. But as I began accumulating covers, my interest was drawn more to the left hand side of a cover, the cachet portion.

One day some 15 years ago, I was sorting through a shoe box of covers to price them for the hospitality room bourse at an upcoming USCS convention. The names or society numbers of the artists or sponsors noted in many of the cachets or on the reverse were mostly unfamiliar to me and I began to wonder who all those people were.

►► Catalog, page 19.

Jaffer Delivers as Promised

By Charles J. Peterson

Last August, speaking at the Writers Unit Breakfast at STaMpsHOW 93 in Houston, Azeez Jaffer promised a meeting between U.S. Postal Service representatives and philatelic writers, as a step toward improving the availability of key philatelic information to the collecting public.

That promise became reality on February 13 and 14, at a Washington, D.C., meeting hosted by the USPS.

Fourteen writers were in attendance: Wayne Youngblood and David Akin, representing Scott Publishing Company; Jay Epping, on behalf of the *Minkus Catalog* and album line; Michael Schreiber and Charles Yeager, for *Linn's*; Peter Martin (among others) for *Stamp Collector*; John Hotchner, as editor of *U.S. Stamps & Postal History*; William McAllister of the *Washington Post*; Tampa *Tribune* and Fort Myers *News-Press* weekly columnist, David Tilton; Gary Griffith for Hearst's and the Bureau Issues Association; Stephen Esrati, with particular interest as editor and publisher of plate number coil information; Richard Nazar as a PNC cataloguer; George Griffenhagen, editor of *Topical Time*; and

myself, as WU30 president and coordinator of philatelic writers' interests with respect to setting up the meeting.

The USPS side of the house was in equal strength, drawn primarily from the Stamp Services and the Corporate Relations/Market and Product Publicity elements. Additionally, James Bruns joined the group for a short discussion on the National Postal Museum.

So what happened?

Azeez Jaffer introduced the informal social gathering on Sunday night with the comment that "we'll break bread tonight before we draw blood tomorrow." And while there were no visible wounds, the Monday session certainly was far from the typical bureaucratic dog-and-pony show. There was a written agenda and a functional outline to the program, but the operating mode was dialogue and (often heated) discussion.

As a result, there were some significant breakthroughs. Most important, there was perceptible growth in understanding on both sides—by the USPS members, who finally began to realize why collectors felt some of

►► Jaffer, page 21.

The Philatelic Communicator

ISSN 0147-3646

The Philatelic Communicator, quarterly journal of Writers Unit 30 of the American Philatelic Society, 2501 Drexel St., Vienna, VA 22180.

The Producer-Publisher is:

Joe F. Frye

P O Box 22308

Memphis TN 38122-0308 . . . (901) 327-8984

The journal is mailed by: Bulk Rate, permit 957, Memphis, TN, to U.S. ZIP code addresses; First Class to Canada and Mexico; AO Airmail (Printed Matter rate) to all others. Please report address changes to the Secretary-Treasurer as soon as known in order to avoid loss of issues.

Writers Unit 30 has as its primary objective the encouragement and improvement of philatelic writing in all of its various forms.

All Writers Unit 30 business *except* editorial matter for this journal should be handled through the Secretary-Treasurer:

George B. Griffenhagen

2501 Drexel Street

Vienna VA 22180-6906 (703) 560-2413

Editorial matters should be handled with the Editor:

Ken Lawrence

P O Box 8040

State College PA 16803-8040

Residence phone (814) 237-3095

Sometimes at APS/APRL

during the day (814) 237-3803

All submissions for publication, without exception, are subject to being edited. Opinions expressed in *The Philatelic Communicator* are those of their authors, but not necessarily of APS Writers Unit 30, its officers, or agents. Letters received by the editor may be published unless labeled "Not for Publication."

Officers of Writers Unit 30, a non-profit corporation, in addition to the Secretary-Treasurer and Editor, are:

Charles J. Peterson President

P O Box 5559

Laurel MD 20726 (301) 776-9822

Alan Warren Vice-President, East

P O Box 17124

Philadelphia PA 19105

Evenings (215) 467-3730

Robert D. Rawlins Vice-President, West

P O Box 981

Healdsburg CA 95448 (707) 431-1109

The Executive Committee includes the officers plus Robert de Violini (immediate past president).

▲ Council

Dane S. Claussen

Ernest E. Fricks

Norma L. McCumber

Russell V. Skavaril

Robert de Violini

Janet Klug

Augustine Serafini

Charles J. G. Verge

DEADLINE

For receipt of copy by the editor:

Second Quarter 1994 April 20, 1994

Literature Exhibition Calendar

April 15-17, 1994

Colopex 1994, Columbus, Ohio. For information write to Dr. Jason H. Manchester, P.O. Box 3128, Columbus, OH 43210.

June 18-19, 1994

Philatelic Literature Fair, Weston, Massachusetts. Information from Cardinal Spellman Philatelic Museum, 235 Wellesley St., Weston, MA 02193.

August 16-25, 1994

Philakorea 1994, Seoul, Korea. For information write to Karol Weyna, 6122 W. 85th Place, Los Angeles, CA 90045.

August 18-21, 1994

STaMpsHOW 94, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Information from American Philatelic Society, P.O. Box 8000, State College, PA 16803.

September 30-October 2, 1994

Sescal 94, Los Angeles, California. Information from Bob de Violini, Sescal Literature, P.O. Box 5025, Oxnard, CA 93031.

October 28-30, 1994

Chicagopex '94, Chicago, Illinois. Information from Chicagopex '94 Literature Exhibition, P.O. Box A03953, Chicago, IL 60690-3953.

May 10-15, 1995

Finlandia. Helsinki, Finland. Information from Roger Quinby, 5 Oak Tree Lane, Schenectady, NY 12309.

September 1-10, 1995

Singapore 95. Singapore. Information from Peter Iber, 9379 W. Escuda Drive, Peoria, AZ 85382.

June 8-16, 1996

Capex '96, Toronto, Ontario. For information write to Capex '96, P.O. Box 204, Station Q, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M4T 2M1.

May 29-June 8, 1997

Pacific 97, San Francisco, California. Information from Pacific 97, Quinby Bldg., Top Floor, 650 S. Grand Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90017-3878. □

Writers who submit articles, letters, or reviews on IBM-compatible diskettes may send them direct to the editor, along with printouts.

President's Message

By Charles J. Peterson

On Judging Critiques

After considerable discussion and serious reflection, I find myself making a philosophical reversal concerning written judges' critique sheets for literature exhibitions—at least, as far as U.S. shows are concerned.

My current feeling is that written comment sheets are still useful, but unless some exceptional combination of circumstances makes it practicable the judging sheets can and should be held to a minimum of narrative commentary.

There are two reinforcing reasons for this rather uncharacteristic comment, and it's probably helpful to look at where we are and how we got there in order to appreciate those reasons.

I've always felt strongly that there have to be some readily understood standards for judging philatelic literature, that judges need to share a common understanding of the application of those standards, and that those judges also must be able to articulate their reasons for judging decisions to their fellow judges and to the exhibitors. Further, exhibition and judging of philatelic literature must serve the promotion and the improvement of literature.

We also have to recognize that by far the greater number of literature exhibitors don't make it to the shows where their material is entered. Unlike the owners of the entries in the frames, for the most part they are unable to take advantage of the oral judges' critiques. To suggest that "if they want a detailed critique, they should come to the show" is to a large extent disenfranchising the many writers and editors of relatively modest means who can't indulge in their hobby to the same financial degree as many of the frame holders.

As a result, by persuasion and personal example I pushed to get acceptance of an expanded, objective critique sheet for literature judging. It's worked reasonably well at shows where I've judged, and the general response from exhibitors has been quite favorable. However—and this is a big however—I've come to realize that a significant number of my fellow literature judges are unhappy with what they view as time-consuming book-reviews-in-miniature.

That's not a reflection on their judging abilities; it's an honest expression of dismay at the amount of time and paperwork that such a procedure imposes on them. They also note the difficulty of finding something new to say about a journal that may not have substantively changed over the last five times it was exhibited—and I must admit that in some cases I, too, am starting to run out of synonyms.

So Reason Number One is the recognition that I seem to have been espousing something that can't really be institutionalized. My own enthusiasms, disposable time, large personal library, and other idiosyncratic attributes aren't transferable, and they aren't essential qualities (at

least not in the same combination and degree) for a good literature judge. In my somewhat mobile career, I learned that organizations and activities can't be dependent on key individuals if they are to survive, and that part of the job is making sure that someone else can do it when you leave. (And that, of course, is consistent with my announcement on my initial election as WU30 President that I'd serve no more than two terms.)

Reason Number Two is (at least) equally significant. The same reasons that led me to the expanded judges' critique sheet gave rise to the establishment of the WU30 writers' critique service: no connection with exhibitions or judging, copied quite unabashedly from the American Association of Philatelic Exhibitors' (AAPE) critique program, but having at its core the general evaluation criteria that are found in the APS Literature Judging guidelines.

The critique program started somewhat slowly, with only a handful of requests during the first year (late 1991 to the end of 1992). For some reason, not many WU30 members seemed interested in taking advantage of it. However, it got favorable mention in the philatelic weeklies, and what had been established primarily as a membership service turned into a non-member service as well.

To date, we have provided approximately 25 such critiques (I know Bob Rawlins and Ken Lawrence have participated, in addition to myself, and I referred at least one person to Cheryl Ganz for help on graphics, but I don't have an accurate count and I'm not particularly worrying about precise statistics). Selected quotes from two letters received at the beginning of this year give testimony to that program:

"One of the main reasons I exhibit . . . (exposure is reason number two) is to receive a helpful critique so I can have things to work on. Your written critiques through the critique service were much more helpful."

"I want to thank you very much for the excellent review of . . . you sent to me in early December. You made some very concrete suggestions that I can implement on my own (new title page look, improve second page presentation, postal history/markings suggestions) and others that I will try to get implemented (uniform presentation of articles, asking for floppy disks I can manipulate, etc.). Your review has provided a good focal point for improvements and I thank you for taking your time and making such a significant effort to provide the information to us. It will certainly benefit us. . . . I appreciate the note on . . . I may just try to summarize the article but more than likely I will contact the author for permission to use the entire article. . . . Regarding postal markings, I believe that we have a member in Israel who has begun a list of computer generated postal markings related to . . . I will contact him, find out what the situation is, and try to promote . . . members to contribute to the catalog. . . . I would also like to appoint myself as the focal point for collecting town names ►►

related to . . . I have no idea why I want to do this, but I have always wanted to have such a list and you have prompted me into it."

With the critique service now functioning as envisioned, and with the program opened up to all writers rather than restricted to members (my unilateral decision—but it also makes a darned good recruiting vehicle!), writers no longer have to rely on the show critique to get practical (and free) guidance.

So what started out as a necessity has become in large measure a redundant encumbrance. I'm still looking to use the expanded narrative judges' critique sheet for special occasions, such as specialized literature exhibitions and venues outside the normal range of Writers Unit or similar support. But unless I hear some loud and persuasive cries from WU members, I'm supporting the return to a less intensive judging sheet. □

Procedures for No-Fee WU30 Critique Service

1. *For periodicals:* Submit the most recent issue(s)—if applicable, 3 or 4 consecutive issues. Include postage equivalent to four times the first class mailing fee for WU30 mailing expenses; any unused amount will be returned.

2. *For books/book manuscripts:* Inquire before sending, with brief description of item; please include stamped, addressed envelope for reply.

3. All submissions/correspondence to: Charles J. Peterson, Box 5559, Laurel, MD 20726. [Phone (301) 776-9822.] □

Literature Judging Advisory

*By William H. Bauer, Chairman,
APS Accreditation of Judges Committee*

Recently there has been some discussion about the length and detail of the written critiques provided at philatelic literature exhibitions. Several people have complained that the critiques provided little substantive information, and others have called for the literature juries to provide lengthy dissertations on the merits of the exhibited publications.

It is the opinion of the APS Accreditation of Judges Committee that a literature competition is not the proper venue for that activity.

It requires considerable time to consolidate notes, to agree on the points to be detailed, and to put it all down on paper. This may be feasible at regional competitions, which usually have a modest number of entries. It is not feasible at the STaMpsHOW literature competition, which often has seventy or more entries. The time required would place an unreasonable burden on the jury and would deny them participation in many of the STaMpsHOW activities.

Therefore, those writers, editors, and publishers who plan to enter the STaMpsHOW literature competition in 1994, or subsequent years, are advised that they must not

►►

GEORGE M. MARTIN 1906-1994

George M. Martin of Yakima, Washington, an active and respected philatelist on national and regional levels for decades, died in Yakima on February 21, 1994. At the time of his death Mr. Martin was the Senior Counsel of the American Philatelic Society; he had previously served as the Society Attorney since 1965. He was a Life member of the APS and received his 50-Year Member award in 1993.

He was one of the first members of Writers Unit 30. He served as our president for two terms, 1969-1973, and then continued service on the WU Council.

Mr. Martin and his wife, Betty, who survives him, were Founder members of the American Philatelic Research Library. Mr. Martin served as the Library's attorney in the incorporation process in 1968. He was a member of the APRL's original Board of Trustees, and was elected vice-president and then president of that body, serving a total of 14 years on the Board, until 1983.

Mr. Martin also served on the Recruiting Committee of the APS, and was always an enthusiastic supporter of youth philately as well. In 1973, in recognition of his work with young collectors, the Junior Division of Writers Unit 30 of the APS presented Mr. Martin with a medal of honor. This particular award was so meaningful to him that he wore it at many philatelic events over the next 20 years.

Mr. Martin received the 1974 Luff Award for Outstanding Services to the APS. The Luff Awards are the Society's highest honors for living philatelists. In addition to his legal services to the Society, Mr. Martin also served for many years as a member of the Society's Expert Committee, Speakers Bureau, and roster of accredited judges.

Mr. Martin's special area of expertise was U.S. postal cards. He was the editor of the United Postal Stationery Society's first *U.S. Postal Card Catalog*, and he also worked on subsequent editions. He wrote extensively in the philatelic press and specialty society journals about postal stationery and about the postal history of the U.S. Northwest. The Northwest Philatelic Federation named him a Distinguished Philatelist in 1962, and in 1966 he was elected to the Washington State Philatelic Hall of Fame.

Mr. Martin was a member of many philatelic societies both in the United States and overseas, and was named a fellow of the Royal Philatelic Society, London, in 1969. □

expect to receive a lengthy and detailed critique. They will receive a brief critique, which we hope will call attention to the good points as well as the most serious weaknesses of their entries.

If an author, editor, or publisher desires a detailed analysis of his or her work, WU30 offers a critique service for that purpose. That is a good place to seek the help required. □

Editor's Bulletin Board

By Ken Lawrence

Thanks to Les Winick and the Collectors Club of Chicago for donating four books to the Spring Writers Breakfast drawing at Sarasota, with retail values from \$35 to \$100 each. Les says that CCC will make similar donations to future WU30 Writers Breakfasts. With support like that, it's no surprise that attendance has been strong. Just a few years ago, we wondered whether the spring breakfast would have a future.

Catching up: The August issue of the Association Internationale des Journalistes Philatéliques *Bulletin* arrived on January 19, and the November issue arrived on February 15. By contrast, I haven't received *The Interleaf* since the June 1992 issue. Our own glass house should not need stoning as of the next issue.

Stamp Collector took to heart Gini Horn's advice in the last issue, about getting the numbers right. The December 25, 1993, issue was whole number 5099, but the January 1, 1994, issue was 6000. Someone noticed that 900 issues had not appeared over the holidays, and the numbering has been corrected.

Boycott The New York Times? Actually, the *Times* has done worse things than drop Barth Healey's stamp column, but it is a shame anyway. It also should send a message that virtually the entire responsibility for promoting our hobby rests on our own publications.

Postmaster General Marvin Runyon could not have picked a worse time to ask my opinion of USPS service. His nationwide survey of randomly selected households asked for my own experiences during the last three months. (But if he were to follow up with a summer survey, he will probably be able to show that customer satisfaction soared between the two polls.)

Topical collectors are snapping up Canada Post's 1993 mint set. The English-language text of the 1993 Collection of the Postage Stamps of Canada calls Queen Elizabeth's lovelorn son, Charles, the "Prince of Whales."

Procuring stamps from the antipode can cause problems. Western Samoa's philatelic bulletin for its set of Coral commemorative stamps, with and without Hong Kong '94 Exhibition overprints, lacked illustrations. The note said, "We regret that at the time of printing bromides did not arrive from UK in time for illustration in bulletin."

Until Bruce Moyer sued Mark Corrinet, I had been unfamiliar with Corrinet's crybaby style of journalism. When I went back and read several of Corrinet's columns in *The Journal of United Nations Philatelists*, I understood their feud better. Still, I was glad when WU30 member Moyer called to report that the lawsuit had been settled, with apologies to Moyer and reimbursement for his costs. Moyer said the terms of the settlement prohibit Corrinet and UNP from commenting on it, but he is free to say what he wants. Had the case gone to trial, it might have been interesting to see Moyer's evidence that

Corrinet's editorial had cost him a million dollars (or whatever) worth of business. If there's that much to be made in U.N. philately, stamp writers as a group ought to be condemned for having failed to report it. If one writer-dealer's business can be hurt badly by a few vain and stupid sentences in a small stamp magazine, that too is unreported news. Readers who savor good news only should lift a toast to the happy outcome.

The National Writers Union (Local 1981 of the United Auto Workers) has sued The New York Times Company, *Time*, and *Newsday*, and two companies that supply microfilm and electronic archives for reselling articles without permission and payment to authors. I am a member of NWU, and will supply information about the union on request.

The Cardinal Spellman Philatelic Museum has developed a new outreach program, using stamps to teach fifth grade geography in local Weston, Massachusetts, schools. For information, call David Formanek at 617-894-6735.

Lloyd A. de Vries manages the new Stamp Collecting Roundtable on the GENIE computer network. He says it is accessible by any computer with a modem, at a cost of \$8.95 per month, which includes four hours' usage; after that, it's \$3 per hour during so-called off-hours, and \$12.50 per hour during prime time, 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Friday. His address is P.O. Box 145, Dumont, NJ 07628-0145.

Kim E. Kellerman, president of the Midwest Stamp Dealers Association, sent a scathing letter to Arthur Morowitz, president of the American Stamp Dealers Association, denouncing ASDA for rescheduling the 1994 fall Mega-Event to conflict with Chicagopex and Florex, and demanding the return of Chicago Philatelic Fair to MSDA control. If you would like a copy, please enclose return postage with your request.

Philatelic Miracle 1. Writing in last summer's issue of *U.S. Stamps & Postal History*, John and Tracy Reznikoff presented an 1851 folded letter by Robert E. Lee. Although postage was not mandatory at that time, the lettersheet is franked with a perfect four-margin U.S. 5-cent Benjamin Franklin stamp of 1847 (Scott 1) "probably affixed, personally" by Lee, tied by a faint Baltimore postmark common on stampless mail of the period, and what appears to be a bold smudged thumbprint. No doubt the expert committee that examines this item will want to exhume Lee's corpse and run some DNA tests.

Philatelic Miracle 2. Not to be outdone by Harry Hagendorf's Columbian Stamp Company, Cherrystone Auctions offered a large 2-cent Columbian embossed envelope franked with a complete set of 1893 U.S. Columbian commemorative stamps, pictured in color on the back cover of its December 1-2, 1993, catalog. The stamps are all neatly tied by an undated black Lynn, Massachusetts, circular registry handstamp. The description says it bears a December 20, 1893, Boston registry arrival oval; "only a few cplt sets known on cover."

New stamp editor. Ron Maifeld's first two issues of *Syncopated Perfs*, newsletter of the Greater Cincinnati Philatelic Society, are superbly done in both form and content. Write to him at P.O. Box 54622, Cincinnati, OH 45254-0622.

New stamp publication. *Yvert News* (in French) is available from Editions Yvert et Tellier, 37, rue des Jacobins, 80036 Amiens Cedex 1, France.

New collecting publication. *Baby Boomer Collectibles, the Pop Culture Collectibles Magazine* will soon be available from 211 N. Lynndale Drive, Appleton, WI 54914. Our hobby's new rivals will be toy ray guns, Pez candy dispensers, Alfred E. Newman tee-shirts, and old jazz records.

Tin Canner, edited by WU30 Council member Janet Klug for the Tonga/Tin Can Mail Study Circle, included part one of a ten-year cumulative index in the January-February 1994 issue. Thanks to President Eugene H. Walters for adding WU30 to their mailing list.

Philately in academia has long been my preferred strategy to assure our hobby's future. Ours is a more justifiable scholarly pursuit than many of the frivolous disciplines that grant degrees these days. A hopeful sign is *Postage Stamps as a Medium of Communication* by Taiye Olyani, a master's thesis in Mass Communication that studied Nigerian stamps. Olyani, now in the public affairs department at Nigeria's postal service headquarters in Lagos, did not say which university sponsored it.

Correction. The caption on page 75 of our Fourth Quarter 1993 issue reversed two pictures. Guy Dillaway is in the lower-left photo, and Bob Rawlins, the lower right.

Retraction and apology. One reader thought that my Second Quarter 1993 letter, page 38, had impugned the integrity of every APS-qualified judge. That certainly was not my intention; I am a judge myself. However, if one reader drew that conclusion, it is possible others read it the same way. To avoid ambiguity, I retract the statement, and apologize to anyone who took offense. I intend to offer any criticism of our judging system constructively and respectfully. □

Perspectives on Judging: A Symposium

Introduction

The January-February 1994 issue of *Yule Log* contains this passage in editor Kathy Ward's "Chatterbox" column: "Imagine my shock and disappointment after five years of steady improvement (wouldn't you agree?) to receive a BRONZE at the most recent Chicagopex. What a put down." She urged readers to send letters of protest to Les Winick, who had chaired the Chicagopex literature jury.

Instead, one sent Les a letter of support. Les replied, "I did not mind her criticism, but what bothered me is that the editor chose to ignore the full page of suggestions that accompanied her bronze award on how to improve the publication."

This is a familiar exchange, and a somewhat more blunt and direct to-and-fro on our system of judging. Since it came on the heels of Bob Rawlins's critical review of the Philitex results, this seemed like a good time to take a new look at how

the system works, and to seek out ways to improve it. The exchange between Ken Lawrence and John Hotchner, and the latest installment from Bob Rawlins, should help to open the discussion. □

Is Our System of Judging Fair?

By Ken Lawrence

Let me begin by confessing my heresy: *Competition* is not my cup of tea, although I'm aware it is our national beverage, right up there with Pepsi and Coke, and that our hobby imbibes as much or more of it than most Americans.

We even foist this addiction on our young people, at the tenderest possible age.

My preferred watchword is *cooperation*. I admire a well-crafted product of individual handiwork, and desire to see it receive proper recognition and reward, but most of the time there are dozens of hidden hands that don't get properly acknowledged.

Those are points of basic philosophy. As an intellectual matter, I'm aware we need and practice both. But in a society that elevates *individualism* to the status of state religion, a collectivist will necessarily swim against the stream.

True to my beliefs, in both Writers Unit 30 and in the American Association of Philatelic Exhibitors, I have advocated non-competitive philatelic and philatelic literature exhibiting, and I have practiced it as much as opportunity has permitted.

Within AAPE, the debate has been moderated by Ann Trigg, who personally holds the view a pole apart from my own. The response thus far has been gratifying, but I doubt we're close to seeing a high-quality stamp show without the mandatory grand, reserve grand, gold, vermeil, silver, silver-bronze, bronze, certificate, and special awards.

If anything, the trend is toward a more extreme level of competition, now that AmeriStamp Expo has brought us the platinum award for top single-frame exhibits. (In reply, Steve Suffet and I have promised to organize AmeriPage Expo, in which top single-page exhibits will each receive a plutonium award, the highest of 87 medal levels.)

Within WU30, the response to non-competitive literature exhibiting has ranged from yawns to condescension, and no literature exhibition I'm aware of has had a court of honor. In the APS Chapter Activities Committee show program and newsletter competitions, we still award medals even though we now call them *critiques*, and stress that they are *not* competitions. At STaMp-SHOW in Houston, one newsletter editor expressed his grave dissatisfaction at the vermeil medal awarded to his entry.

He is not the only one to have denounced me for having been an unfair judge, although his complaint was facilitated in this instance by critique sheets that included each judge's vote. In national-level competition, individual judges' evaluations are supposed to be secret, al-

though that rule too is frequently observed in the breach.

One sore Milcopex 93 philatelic exhibitor has been badgering me ever since in protest of his vermeil, even though I was a mere apprentice without a vote on that jury. One of the judges told the exhibitor that his exhibit really deserved a gold but that I, the apprentice, had argued the others down to a vermeil.

At my next philatelic judging apprenticeship during the 1993 Garfield-Perry March Party exhibition, one unhappy vermeil winner actually accused me of having read too much on the subject of his exhibit, leaving me unfit to appreciate his previously unrecorded achievements.

At Sescal 93, one exhibitor who mistakenly thought I was on the philatelic jury (I was actually on the literature jury) bitterly complained that not only had he not received the grand award he properly deserved, but he had not even been awarded the consolation reserve grand.

I had qualified as a philatelic and philatelic literature judge for many reasons. First, because I do legitimately enjoy and learn from our system as it has evolved, and desire to participate fully; second, because one earns the right to propose reforms only by being fully appreciative of the system's existing positive elements.

Thus far, none of my fellow jurors has accused me of ignorance, prejudice, or venality in my participation from the local level to the national, so the advice to dismiss exhibitors' complaints as sour grapes is attractive. Nevertheless, that seems too glib a dismissal of a chronic problem, in the sense that where there's smoke, there must be at least a glowing ember.

Furthermore, the most successful exhibitors are often the ones who hold the strongest conviction that judging is fundamentally unfair. Often in my investigative reporting, my sources insist on confidentiality because they fear that becoming known will cost them in exhibition medal levels.

I have not seen proof of this, but their haunting fears are certainly genuine, and deserve both respect and relief. On the other hand, I have myself been excoriated for having expressed in these pages my personal belief that double standards are often applied in judging.

This is such a touchy matter that I was sharply rebuked at Sescal for my joking remark that we had awarded the obligatory gold medal to the *Congress Book*. (Yes, of course, the award was richly deserved.)

For me, these experiences have been both surprising and dismaying, but they have also reinforced my underlying philosophical conviction. Cutthroat competition takes a toll on what ought to be an enjoyable and festive, even frivolous social and cultural activity.

Now, the discussion is taking a couple of different turns, both of which deserve consideration.

One is an observation that *Linn's* editor and publisher Michael Laurence has made to me several times. As most veteran exhibitors are aware, Mike has a wonderful collection of United States 10-cent 1869 stamps and

covers, yet alert show-goers may have noticed that we haven't seen it fully displayed in some time.

Mike says this is because he thinks it won't be judged fairly.

"Those of us who are public figures in the hobby can expect that the awards we receive will be given for who we are, not for what we exhibit. Sometimes the award will be too high, from juries that want to honor us. Sometimes they will be too low, if the jurors have less positive feelings about us. But it's almost impossible for jurors to put these considerations aside and to give an objective award."

Mike has not altogether abandoned exhibiting, and he promises to have his best material on display for the 125th anniversary of the 1869 issue. (That, of course, reinforces my original point, since he'll be exhibiting as part of an effort by all the 1869 aficionados to show their material collectively.) I hope it won't be long before we get to see his Elvis Presley topical material in the frames too.

A couple of my recent experiences tend to reinforce Mike's point. In both instances, once in literature and once in philatelic exhibiting, my entries fell from a top medal level to fifth medal level in consecutive competitions. That isn't supposed to happen when material is judged by APS-qualified judges, but it did.

The literature example is the Lidman Prize competition.

Three years ago, I inherited from Barbara Mueller the contract to write and to illustrate the Stamps and Stamp Collecting chapters of two encyclopedia yearbooks, *Collier's* and *Funk and Wagnall's*. The Collier chapter is longer, but illustrated with a single black-and-white photo. The Funk and Wagnall's chapter is a compressed version of the same text, but with a full-page color layout of U.S. and worldwide stamps.

Each successive year the editors have increased my word allotment, which is the best possible evidence of their satisfaction, but even so, space is so precious that the article must be written to formula: a lead that gives the most important stamp and stamp hobby events in the United States and the world, an expanded paragraph about the year's output of U.S. stamps and postal stationery, a similar paragraph that highlights the most interesting or most newsworthy stamps from the rest of the world, and a final paragraph on the year's most important auction results and the overall condition of the stamp market. Thus the literary and philatelic content is necessarily almost identical from year to year.

I entered the 1991 yearbook chapters in the 1992 Lidman competition, taking the competition itself at face value. That is, the award itself is of small interest to me, since there isn't much I can do to change the content if the publisher does renew the contract, but a nice award just might add a note of encouragement to the publisher to continue the item, at a time when stamp columns in the non-philatelic press are an endangered species. ►►

The entry won a gold medal, and the publisher was indeed pleasantly surprised.

For me that was sufficient, but my companion decided to bulk up this year's meager batch of entries by submitting the 1992 yearbook chapters. They were awarded a bronze medal, which is not likely to send the message one would hope for.

(Two sentences of my lead were unfortunately conflated into one by my editors. The rewrite made it seem as though stamp collectors are enthusiastic about the huge number of new issues. I can imagine that the jury didn't take too well to that, just as I did not, but the rest of the article in both versions was a virtual clone of last year's earlier entry. One bad sentence might arguably cost a full medal level on a bad day, but four levels?)

The second example is my single-frame plate number coil exhibit, titled *The Key PNC*. At Thamespex 92, alongside a large group of other PNC exhibits, it received a gold medal and two special awards. At AmeriStamp Expo 93, it received a silver-bronze. That's also a fall from top to fifth level, because the top AmeriStamp medal was platinum.

Neither was a national-level competition, but both employed APS qualified judges, and both jury panels included collectors with sophisticated knowledge of PNCs, so neither can be dismissed as the fluke award of an ignorant jury.

I suspect that these results are evidence of Michael Laurence's point.

Meanwhile, alongside those concerns Bob Rawlins has initiated a debate over the relative fairness or unfairness within literature judging between the way serial publications and books are judged. He carries those concerns further in this issue.

In my opinion, we have only begun to state the problem or problems, and are probably not yet poised to solve them. But that is the necessary first step. Now let the debate continue. □

Mixed Fruit

By John M. Hotchner

Apples, oranges, bananas, peaches, raspberries, and kiwi! The worthy author of the prior piece makes his points clearly enough, but when it comes time to offer proofs, he too often does an apples and oranges number that doesn't compute.

But let's start at the top. He begins an article titled "Is Judging Fair" with an introduction on his attitudes toward competition and asserts that "our hobby imbibes as much or more of it than most Americans." That's a sweeping generalization, and one that has little to do with the point of the article.

Besides which, it is wrong. It is arguably true that the two to three thousand people who are involved in competitive exhibiting are more competitive than most Americans. But even that number is a small percentage of the millions of collectors.

The fact is that most collectors don't get involved in exhibiting because they are quite happy, thank you, with what they are doing to amuse themselves with their hobby. Yet, without competition and rewards and recognition, there would be precious little exhibiting and thus sharing of the work and scholarship that an exhibit represents.

I simply don't believe for a minute that lack of formal competition would be good for the hobby; specifically, I doubt many people would be motivated to share their pleasure and joy in the creation and development of their displays (be they stamps, postal history, or literature).

In his ninth through twelfth paragraphs, Ken finally gets to his subject, and it is in the context of people thinking he may have been unfair as a judge. I hasten to add that I have served with him and believe he is a careful and dispassionate evaluator.

Which helps to prove a point: that every judge, no matter how good (and some aren't), will regularly receive brickbats from exhibitors. Why? Because they have behaved badly? Sometimes. . . . But more often it is because the exhibitor is looking for someone to blame other than him or herself for a medal level or critique that is disappointing or painful.

The successful exhibitor—in stamps/covers or literature—is the one who learns to sort through those feelings and the information gained from the judge and apply the information to making his or her product better.

This process is frequently painful for the exhibitor and sometimes for the judge, but when you watch your or someone else's effort grow and reach its theoretical level of excellence, the pain becomes a dim memory.

This kind of growth rarely happens unless the person who must do the work sees some sort of pot of gold at the end of the rainbow; something that keeps the worker from quitting in frustration, or failing to address the needs because who really cares anyway. . . .

There is plenty of unfairness in judging. It is no more perfect than any other field of human endeavor. I agree that subconscious considerations enter into the process. I agree that ignorance skews results. I agree that there are egregious examples of indefensible sequences of results.

I also believe that the system is becoming more fair. That judges are working harder to be knowledgeable. That the ethical and performance standards for being a judge are rising. That instances of real unfairness in exhibit judging, when the field is viewed as a whole, are minimal and shrinking.

Thus, I support efforts to encourage judges to be better, and to modify the institutional framework so that it produces ever fairer results. I do not support throwing out the entire system.

This seems to be the appropriate point to look at the mixed fruit, the two instances in his own exhibiting exploits that he sees as unfair. First, he mentions his experience with the Lidman competition. I encourage you to go back and reread that portion of his text.

Briefly, virtually the same entry was considered by the 1992 and 1993 juries. It won a gold in 1992; a bronze in 1993. Ken makes the introductory point that this sort of thing isn't supposed to happen when material is judged by APS-qualified judges.

The fact is that the 1992 Lidman jury (a competition which is not a part of the APS judging system, and is judged according to its own criteria) had one APS-qualified judge among the three-person jury.

Two of the three 1993 jury members were APS-qualified, including this writer. I can't speak for the prior jury, but I am firmly committed to the proposition that the bronze award is correct according to the judging criteria.

A truism among judges is that we are responsible for neither the brilliance nor stupidity of prior juries. I'm sure Ken would have it no other way. I doubt he would prefer that a prior mistake be slavishly and thoughtlessly confirmed.

His second example is his single-frame plate number coil exhibit, titled *The Key PNC*. At Thamespex it received a gold. At AmeriStamp Expo it received a silver-bronze. This sounds like grievous and horribly unfair treatment—until you consider that:

1. Thamespex is a local show with its own criteria and judges; who may have been APS accredited, but who, judging at the local level, emphasize encouragement.

2. AmeriStamp Expo was not an APS event, but was a national level show with a wide range of highly competitive exhibits. New judging criteria specifically designed for one-frame exhibits were used, as were some of the best and most experienced of APS judges.

So, Ken is quite right. The awards were no fluke. I suspect they were both proper for the venue and the competition.

Finally, I want to comment upon Ken's assertion that "the most successful exhibitors are often the ones who hold the strongest conviction that judging is fundamentally unfair. . . ."

I don't know how wide a universe of the most successful exhibitors he has polled, but I would be willing to bet I have spoken to and corresponded with a far wider sample of both successful and less successful exhibitors than his in my hat as editor of *The Philatelic Exhibitor*, as a judge (stamps and literature) for approximately 10 years, and as an exhibitor who spent a lot of years learning how to do it effectively before I hit the big time.

The great majority of exhibitors I know feel that the system is fundamentally fair though imperfect. It is the folks at the lower end of the scale who are most likely to feel that unfairness abounds. Most of them, after all, are not getting the medal levels they believe they should.

If there are consistent gold-winners who are afraid of offending someone and losing their golds, I suggest they continue to improve their exhibit so as to make that impossible.

If anyone believes they will be given a leg up because they are well-known, my experience with developing exhibitors tells me that exhibit flaws take on, if anything, increased significance because, as one friendly judge recently said to me, "You should know better!"

I thank Ken for his invitation to answer his opening shot in this debate. I join him in inviting you, dear readers, to join in. □

PhiliteX '92 Judging Re-Visited

By Bob Rawlins

I've been pleased to see a number of letters to the editor, both pro and con, concerning my article "PhiliteX '92 Revisited" (Second Quarter 1993 *Philatelic Communicator*). I think a wide-ranging discussion in the area of philatelic exhibits can only be beneficial.

In the Fourth Quarter 1993 *PC*, Robert Ausubel wondered if I had completed my graduate work at the *New York Post*. Not so, I obtained my MS in Electronic (Acoustic) Engineering at the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California 93943-5001.

I've included the mailing address in case the good doctor wants to write the Superintendent, RADM Thomas A. Mercer, USN to advise him that his fully accredited institution of higher learning is inappropriately named.

Dr. Ausubel correctly pointed out my error in defining "median." Median is most surely the midpoint of a numerical series rather than the arithmetic mean, a careless goof on my part.

However, Ausubel implied that since the "value" basis required to jump from one medal level to another is not quantifiable, my analysis is deficient or perhaps invalid. I don't agree.

APS judges have steadfastly resisted grading exhibits numerically, but if they were to accept a point system, it is illogical to suppose they would ascribe, say, a 20-point difference between average vermeil and average gold, but only a 10-point difference between average bronze and average silver bronze.

My experience as a USCS exhibit judge (where we do grade numerically) is that judges think linearly rather than non-linearly in terms of assigning medal levels.

But whether they think linearly or not, it is logical that judges would assign medal levels to books and to periodicals in the same relative fashion within each category. Ausubel's red herring aside, the thrust of my article was that the one-medal-level difference in the median between books and periodicals at PhiliteX '92 indicated either a generally lower quality of periodicals submitted or a judging bias in favor of books or against periodicals.

A senior judge at PhiliteX assured me it was the former that accounted for the difference, but I have my doubts that such is entirely the case. Over the five or six years that I have participated in literature exhibits, read critiques, reviewed the exhibits, and analyzed the record-

►►

ed results, I had gradually come to believe that philatelic periodicals are, indeed, considered by philatelic judges as the poor cousins of philatelic books.

PhiliteX '92 provided the opportunity to plot the results of a competition with enough entries to provide a creditable statistical analysis.

Look at the results of 1993 literature competitions listed in the Fourth Quarter 1993 *PC*. The numbers of entries are too small to generalize, but the plot of awards mostly seems to support my contention. The table below shows both the number of entries in the category and the median (mid-point of the series):

	Books	Journals
STaMpsHOW '93	23 Silver	43 Silver Bronze
SescaL '93	9 Vermeil	12 midway S-SB
Chicagopex '93	17 midway S-SB	12 low Silver

The Chicagopex results are noteworthy in that the journal median is actually slightly higher than the book median. The book plot is skewed to the right by a large group of books in the silver bronze category. Clearly, that jury gave no quarter.

In most societies, the journal consumes the bulk of the budget and the editor perforce must pinch pennies. Most boards of directors view increasing society dues with about the same enthusiasm as leaping off the Golden Gate bridge. So let's face it, the average periodical is inferior to the average book in areas such as quality of paper, binding, and cover.

The material in periodicals may range from trivial to substantial, depending on the degree of cooperation by society members, and the editor has to make do with what he has. And periodicals generally have lots of ephemera—auctions, ads, obituaries, membership lists, treasurer's report, and assorted trivia absent from books.

If the two categories are judged to the same standard, and they certainly appear to be, periodicals will necessarily come off second best. In my observation, the periodicals that are evaluated highest are the ones that are most "booklike." Beauty may be only skin deep but definitely is a player in this game.

I have observed that there is also a hierarchy within periodicals with respect to medal levels. Generally, periodicals issued two, three, or four times a year receive the highest awards. The articles are usually "scholarly" and the resulting journal most booklike.

At the other end of the scale, journals published monthly or bi-monthly are more like *Linn's Stamp News* than *The Congress Book*, for example. That's not to disparage *Linn's*, which does a superb job, but the extra baggage carried by monthlies simply makes them less scholarly in juries' eyes.

I daresay that, as editor of a monthly, I labor harder than most, perhaps all, editors of quarterly or semiannual journals. But we don't submit our time cards to the jury and, even if we did, it's not the effort but the perceived end result that counts most.

The intangible in this game is how well a journal

serves its particular membership. Jury members cannot really know that unless, of course, one happens to be a member of the society whose journal is in competition. But that information is superfluous since it is not included as one of the items assessed.

Nor are other items of great import to members of a society, such as whether the periodical is produced within budget or issued on time. If a book is issued three months later than scheduled by the author who knows or cares? If an issue of the society newsletter is three months late, every member knows and some even care.

That sort of thing is not part of the judging evaluation. Should it be? I think so, but I haven't quite figured out how to get unfudged information to the jury.

More heresy. I think that philatelic books and periodicals should be judged to different, but equivalent, standards. And the periodical standard should include some of the items that I have noted in my diatribe from this soapbox.

Bottom line. If an editor truly wants a meaningful evaluation of his journal, he or she should use the WU30 critique service. You won't get a medal, but you will get straight talk and good advice.

If the editor wants some publicity for the society, enter one or more of the philatelic literature competitions, but don't expect much in the way of an evaluation. The system is simply not geared for a thoughtful or detailed critique.

And if he or she is chasing medals, he or she will do well to insure his or her product has a stiff cover, slick paper, scholarly material, and a minimum of ephemera.

If I sound bitter or disillusioned, I'm not. I'm a realist and am just telling it as it is.

A proposal. I would like to submit my journal to the half dozen shows that feature literature competitions for the exposure the competition may give my society. But I don't need any more pieces of silver and can do without gratuitous comments on a critique sheet hastily filled in by an overburdened judge.

Therefore, I would like to see show committees actively seek and encourage non-competitive literature entries. Who knows, a wide range of literature entries, both competitive and non-competitive, might provide an added bit of attraction for the show, assuming, of course, that exhibits are "attractively displayed."

OK, judges and editors, fire away. I've battened down the hatches and am ready for your (verbal) barrage. □

Writers Wanted

By Ken Lawrence

Dr. Roger Schnell, chairman of the APS Long-Range Planning Committee, is asking writers to assist him in an APS outreach effort to new constituencies. He and I met at breakfast during the APS Spring Meeting in Sarasota, and he shared his ideas while I jotted notes.

Roger's idea is to present "canned" articles on stamp collecting to magazines that serve various professions, such as doctors, lawyers, accountants, architects, and so forth. Most state and national organizations have such journals, and are eager to have interesting articles slanted to their special readerships.

Professional people tend to be joiners, Roger said, so if we can catch their attention, APS will surely benefit.

Taking his own medical profession as an example, Roger showed me copies of *The Journal of the Florida Medical Association*, a slick monthly. Its editor encourages authors to submit articles on "subject matter relevant to the practice of medicine."

("Information for Authors" stresses that the magazine does not want material simultaneously published elsewhere, and does acquire the copyright to material it publishes.)

"Why not 'The Great Stress Reliever—Every Doctor Needs a Hobby'?" asks Roger. "Or, for *Medical Economics*, perhaps an article titled 'Stamps, Mainly for Fun, but Also for Profit,' possibly showing how rare stamps might serve as a hedge against inflation."

Besides professional journals, Roger would like to target publications for adults aged 30 to 40, who no longer have heavy family commitments and are searching for interesting activities—especially women of that age bracket.

Magazines pitched to retirees are another possibility, although some, like *Modern Maturity*, can be tough to crack.

Even publications for other hobbies provide good prospects. Roger gave me a copy of the January 1994 *QST*, the magazine of amateur radio, with front cover and five pages of full-color illustrations devoted to "Amateur Radio Postage Stamps" by Bill Welsh.

So, writers, may we have a volunteer to try one or two submissions? If this works, it could provide a good market for someone's prose, because there are so many publications in these various fields.

Those who want samples of these materials may write to me. If you want to volunteer, contact Dr. Roger Schnell, 4800 N.E. 20th Terrace, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33308. □

Nordic Journal Celebrates Centennial

By Alan Warren

The December 1993 issue of the Danish journal *Nordisk Filatelistisk Tidsskrift* ("Nordic Philatelic Periodical") completes one hundred years of publication, making it one of the hobby's oldest magazines.

This particular issue serves a dual purpose. In addition to the usual articles the publication is also the catalog for the Hafnia 94 exhibition held in Copenhagen January 27-30, 1994.

The exhibition was restricted to literature and modern philately (Mophila) entries.

In the latter part of the 19th century, several aborted

attempts were made to publish philatelic journals in the Scandinavian areas. Most died after one issue, or perhaps a year of effort.

In the spring of 1893, the Philatelic Society of Lund, Sweden, invited other nordic societies to hold a joint meeting with their members in Lund.

One of the outcomes was the combining of two journals into *NFT* beginning with the January 1894 issue.

The journal served as the official organ of collector societies in Stockholm, Gothenburg, Oslo (or Christiania as it was known then), Copenhagen, Lund, Uppsala, and Helsinki.

Editorship of the journal rotated among Denmark, Sweden, and Norway for several years, but eventually the onus fell on the Danes to keep the journal going.

Some past editors of *NFT* include luminaries well-recognized in Scandinavian philately such as Henrik Dethloff, Nils Strandell, Abr. Oldfjell, M. Brun-Pedersen, and Hans Ehler Jensen.

Jessen served as editor three times including the longest run from 1971 to 1985. He was brought back temporarily in 1990 until the current editor Max Meedom was signed up.

This issue of *NFT* includes some excerpts reprinted from the first issue. The internationally recognized postal history expert Paul Jensen contributed an article on the pleasure and benefits of philatelic literature and the importance of building one's own reference library.

Our own Charles J. Peterson also contributed an article in this issue. Charlie served on the jury for the show. In his article he stressed some of the important contributions that philatelic periodicals make.

Some significant studies appeared, often serially, in philatelic journals, which may never have been reprinted as separates.

Another contribution that Charlie pointed out is the correction of information that has appeared elsewhere in print. Still other points that journals can make include identification of faked covers, and important information on back-of-the-book material such as locals, revenues, and postal stationery.

A final contribution noted by Charlie that is often found in the pages of journals, are the histories of philatelic organizations and philately in general. He stressed the importance of periodic cumulative indexes as the essential tool for accessing the information to be tapped in these journals. And in fact he chides the publisher of *NFT* by noting that the most recent such index for their own journal that he is aware of was printed in 1931!

Some 64 pages of the December issue of the journal are devoted to the Hafnia catalog itself. In the literature categories there were 181 handbook entries, 37 catalogs, 84 periodicals, and 15 articles. In addition to the 54 modern philately exhibits there was a court of honor and some exhibits from philatelic societies in the various nordic countries. □

Auction Catalogs as Literature

By Ken Lawrence

At Philitex '92, Calvet M. Hahn gave two presentations on research using auction catalogs as sources. That is important, but I have been equally interested in the qualities intrinsic to the text one finds in certain catalogs, both of style and of substance.

For example, here is an excerpt from the introductory matter of the catalog for the February 25, 1994, L.D. Mayo Jr. Public Philatelic Auction Number 16:

"Karol Weyna's last piece in *U.S. Stamps & Postal History*, to the effect that it is "legal" for an auctioneer [read "agent"] to create underbids [read "commit fraud"] to jack up the price to his book bidders [read "principals"] raised my hackles. Aside from the fact that, as far as I can tell, neither Weyna nor his publishers are licensed to dispense legal advice, there is the problem that the opinion expressed is just plain wrong."

Besides being a phrasemaker and auctioneer, Dann Mayo is a lawyer. He plans to publish a rebuttal to Weyna, and invites input from buyers, sellers, and auction house employees. That should be of greater than usual interest. Dann once suggested that a person who had been victimized by an auction using Weyna's "legal" strategy probably could retire on the proceeds of a lawsuit for damages.

However, Dann's lot descriptions set records for brevity. To find elegance in that category, one must search elsewhere. Merritt Jenkins of Knoxville supplied the following examples, all describing the same plate number block of the 90-cent purple Oliver Perry stamp of 1888, Scott 218, illustrated here.

The block first caught Jenkins's attention as lot number 113, with a full size photograph, in the catalog for the John W. Kaufmann Inc. Auction 126, held October 22-24, 1986. There we read this description:

"★ PB 90c Purple (218), B impt & pl #23 block of 10, major rejoined separation (in fact both strips of 5 are completely rejoined), album remnants on gum & creases in selvage, nice color but average centering. Still a very collectible example of this Rare block. (Photo) 22,500.00"

According to Melissa Wheeler of Purser Associates, the agents who do my bidding, it sold for \$1,700 to



Which catalog description best describes this 19th-century plate block?

Larry Sachs.

(Along with his brother Richard, Lawrence Sachs was the subject of a report by Tom Maeder in our Third Quarter 1989 issue. In our Second Quarter 1990 issue, I reported on the Sachs brothers' expulsion from ASDA. The new ASDA regime has readmitted them to membership, which prompted others to resign in protest.)

Jenkins next noticed the block as lot number 590 in the Ivy, Shreve & Mader December 13-14, 1991, auction titled *The President's Sale*, accompanied by a minuscule photo and this description:

"★ □ #218, 90c Purple, bottom margin imprint and plate "No. 23" block of ten, fresh deep color and full o.g. that has only been lightly hinged, there are quite a number of gum rejoined perforations and light creasing in the selvage, still a very rare plate block item in any condition, this one being fine and quite attractive. (photo) 22,500.00"

The Purser records show that it opened at \$3,000, and sold to the book for \$3,500. According to Melissa, that could mean the consignor bought it back. The Pursers have complained that Ivy auctions do not announce when lots are returned to consignors, despite a New York law that seems to require that, an interpretation Jacques C. Schiff Jr. has verified.

In the event, Jenkins spotted it again as lot 735, still with a tiny illustration, in the Ivy, Shreve & Mader 1992 Autumn New York Sale held October 22-24 and 28-29. Miracle of miracles, the block was more beautiful than ever:

"★ □ #218, 90c Purple, bottom margin imprint and plate "No. 23" block of ten, wonderfully fresh, with

vivid color and full o.g. that has been only lightly hinged, a number of perforations gum-rejoined, some light creasing in the selvage, still a fine example of this plate block rarity. (photo) 22,500.00"

Melissa said the successful \$3,250 bidder was George Fredericks who at that sale was bidding both for himself and for Dana Okey. Since Fredericks and Okey are dealers, the miracle block may yet be knocking around the trade.

Those wonderfully fresh, vivid, lightly hinged lot describers down in Dallas sure do earn their keep.

□

LETTERS

From Michel Forand: I have read Charles Peterson's review of the 1993 *Congress Book* with great interest. (Fourth Quarter 1993 PC) While I have not responded publicly to his or any other reviews of "my" two previous *Congress Books*, I think some observations are in order this time because Charlie's comments seem to be based on a rather restrictive notion of what the *Congress Book* should be and what type of article it should contain.

In his review, Peterson has mildly to wildly favorable comments about six of the seven articles in the book. Yet he writes that he found "much of it [the *Congress Book*] to be uninteresting, turgid, or otherwise off-putting."

Under the circumstances, that's a pretty sweeping statement. How can the sum be so much worse than the parts? Was Charlie afraid he was being too positive?

Your reviewer also claims that the 1993 book does not provide "material that will be of use and interest to the majority of subscribers." It seems clear to me that a publication as diverse as the *Congress Book* must be cannot possibly meet such a demanding test, and I don't think any editor would be reckless enough to try.

Each article will be of use or interest to some readers, but it would be unrealistic to hope that every article will satisfy the curiosity of every reader—or even most readers. And I don't care how much of a "philatelic generalist" Charlie considers himself to be, he can't possibly be equally interested in everything he reads. Nobody is that virtuous.

It is presumably this concern for the "majority of subscribers" that leads Peterson to criticize Bill Waggoner's paper on stamped consular forms as dealing with "a very tangential collecting specialty." He adds: "It's definitely a well-researched piece, but much more appropriate as a stand-alone monograph than as an article in the *Congress Book*."

Why? The *Congress Book* has often included articles dealing with highly specialized topics in the past, and I think the American Philatelic Congress is proud to have occasionally acted as possibly the only major outlet for what some may view as esoteric subject matter.

It must also be pointed out that those very specialized papers (including Waggoner's) are often based on exhibits that have earned high-level awards (*i.e.*, vermeil

or better) at APS-sponsored stamp shows, which suggests that tangential specialties are not that far removed from the mainstream.

Changing directions, Peterson faults Jack Arnell's article on transatlantic mail during the War of 1812 for being "a discussion based on selected pieces, rather than a comprehensive treatment illustrated by examples."

There is no requirement that papers published in the *Congress Book* should provide a comprehensive treatment of their subject. Articles should nonetheless have a dominant theme and provide some overview of the subject, and I think Arnell succeeds quite well in showing how merchants in the United States and England continued to trade and correspond during the war despite blockades and various other measures taken by their respective governments to impede these activities.

The title of the article specifically refers to "correspondence," not to a comprehensive view of the postal history of the war or of postal relations between the parties involved. Perhaps Charlie was looking for something else; if so, it is not surprising that he was disappointed.

Peterson refers to "some execrable photos" and "extremely bad photo reproductions" in the book. While I admit that a few photos are less than totally satisfactory, to characterize them in such negative terms is overkill.

About three photos (out of a total of about 155 illustrations) are somewhat darker than one might have wished, but they are more than adequate at fulfilling their function, which is to show differences in stamp designs or overprints. The stamps shown in those photos are deep red, a notoriously difficult color to reproduce well in black and white.

The authors of *Congress Book* papers are unpaid, and the Congress is not in a position to demand that they illustrate their articles with photos meeting the exacting standards of professional periodicals, although we naturally hope they will make every effort to provide good illustrations.

One might argue that Peterson did not have to take these factors into consideration in his review, but he did have a responsibility to offer a balanced judgment, something he failed to do where the illustrations are concerned.

There are other points with which one might quibble, but it is the reviewer's prerogative to assess a publication on its perceived merits, as Peterson was asked to. What I do question is his notion that the scope of the *Congress Book* should be narrower than it is with respect to either content or approach.

Quality of research is the prime criterion, and I am satisfied that the *Congress Book* meets this standard, although there can be no guarantee that every article will be of immediate interest to every reader.

The last point raised by Peterson in his review—the inconsistent way in which the *Congress Book* refers ►►

to itself—is quite valid. That ambiguity stems, in part, from the fact that since its first edition in 1935, the *Congress Book* has contained the official proceedings of the annual convention of the Congress, including the research papers that were read by their authors on that occasion.

The *Congress Book* is still officially released on the day that the papers themselves are read, paraphrased, summarized, or commented upon by their authors at the annual convention. As a consequence, there is some resistance, among long-standing members, to the idea of the book being totally independent from the convention and to its title reflecting that separation.

Although I have abandoned or modified some traditions in the three editions of the book published under my direction so far, I have felt bound by others, even when I am not necessarily comfortable with them. Efforts in this direction will continue. □

From E. E. Fricks: Further to George Griffenhagen's comments in the Fourth Quarter *Communicator*, I had a similar experience with an author a couple of years ago.

The author, a well-known writer in our hobby, had submitted copy to me for the *Collectors Club Philatelist* and to another national-distribution publication. I only discovered this, while reading final proofs, when the article appeared in the other venue.

In this case, there was no lack of integrity, as I know the author quite well, but a lack of communication.

What was annoying, besides the editorial effort that had gone into research to correct some errors of fact and research to flesh out some pieces of the story, was the fact that the article had been recycled from a British publication some eight years previously. No indication of the recycling had been provided, only stumbled upon during research.

However, even that article represented a rehash of a CCP article that had appeared in the 1920s. The author had not cited or even reread the old article but relied upon memory, garbling some of the information in the process.

More serious was ignoring subsequent information in well-known specialist journals that corrected some erroneous initial reports.

[Postscript to Joe Frye: No rabbit tracks, but you'd get 'em if there were!] □

From Robert de Violini: Robert Ausubel (or maybe it's only Joe Frye "~~at~~work" again) misspells the November 1992 New York literature show. It was PhilITex, not Philatex, and Charlie Peterson has already noted in print the WordPerfect spellchecker's suggested replacement word - fellatio (which, when spelled with one l, generates a list of 26 possibles).

And while I have your attention, let's all try to keep the name straight of the next FIP exhibition to be held in the U.S. The name of the stamp exhibition that follows in the line of FIPEX, SIPEX, Interphil and Ameripex is *not* Pacifica, as many seem to want to call it. It is

PACIFIC 97®, and properly, and fully, written out it becomes World Philatelic Exhibition, PACIFIC 97, Inc.

The name PACIFIC 97 is in all capital letters, and is registered with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. The Golden Gate Club™ is a registered Service Mark. Gene Tinsley will be glad to fill anyone in on what this all means.

For your list of Literature Exhibitions: With respect to SESCAL, please add the contact person for literature information: Bob de Violini, SESCAL Literature, P.O. Box 5025, Oxnard, CA 93031. Wallace Craig is the general chairman of the show.

Later dates for SESCAL are:

1995 — October 6 to 8	1998 — October 2 to 4
1996 — October 4 to 6	1999 — October 1 to 3
1997 — October 3 to 5	2000 — October 6 to 8

The SESCAL 1994 Literature Exhibition prospectus will be ready by the time the First Quarter 1994 issue of *TPC* sees the post office. □

The editor replies: I thank Bob de Violini for the corrected Sescal information, which has been entered on the page 2 calendar.

With respect to Philatex, I think Bob must have missed the American Stamp Dealers Association advertisements and flyers that used that spelling. A couple of us quipped about it in these pages, which prompted Robert Ausubel's further comment.

On the other points, we have been around this course before. For the benefit of those who came in at the intermission, this is our policy:

The only proprietary term we indulge (with misgivings) is STAMPSHOW, because APS is our sponsor. Otherwise, we follow standard and sensible rules of English for proper and common nouns and adjectives. That means, for example, we follow our dictionary in writing xerox, to the consternation of a similarly named powerful multinational corporation based in Rochester (and to the delight of its lawyers, who make their living writing testy letters to editors and publishers).

If Pacific 97, Sescal, *Stamps* magazine, or the Xerox Corporation wish to place paid advertisements in *The Philatelic Communicator*, they may use whatever fonts, letter combinations, logotypes, registered trademarks, copyrighted phrases, miniature symbols, and other affectations they wish, but that will not alter our editorial policy.

In running my AmiPro spell checker on this snippet, it balked at xerox and preferred Xerox, but it did not offer fellatio. □

From Mark H. Winnegrad: Reference Dr. Ausubel's letter regarding Joe Frye's use of the French word "débridement" in Frye's article, "Toll-Free Gets A Lot of Calls." Dr. Ausubel could not find "débridement" in his 1934 edition of *Heath's Standard French and English Dictionary*, and thus hypothesized that either the noun did

not exist or that it was relatively new.

Dr. Ausubel's comments prompted me to look up "débridement" in my 1966 edition of the *Petit Larousse*, and as expected, I found it. More interesting, though, is that the word is also included in my *Cassell's New French-English/English-French Dictionary*, published by Funk & Wagnalls in 1930.

As an aside, that dictionary has seen lots of use. My mother, who was a French major at New York's Hunter College (class of June '29), purchased it about a year after graduation, and I used it regularly more than 35 years later when I, too, studied French literature at Hunter College in The Bronx, which became Herbert H. Lehman College in 1968.

As for "débridement," it certainly does exist and is not relatively new. Apparently it was just not included in the dictionary that Dr. Ausubel consulted. □

Publisher's note: Vindication sweeps the nation. Seems I was ratxx ritexx once(t)—at least, partly. My reference that gave me the é for my article (yes, I did look up the spelling) is *Cassell's New Compact French Dictionary*, 12th edition, June 1977. Seems I looked up the word for accent mark(s) and didn't read the English translation. My usage was intended to refer to what a surgeon does to a dirty wound before closing or treating it, but that's not what the *Cassell's* translation includes.

The good news is that Dr. Ausubel's welcome letter prompted me to check the English-language dictionary I've been using since I first became editor of *The News Bulletin*, long out of date, and to purchase the Tenth Edition of *Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, a much-expanded and far more useful work than the same publisher's Seventh Edition that I'd used for so many years. The new one not only includes as an *English* word "debridement" (no grâve), but some juicy *slang* words! □

From Kenneth T. Stewart: Just a short note to let you know how much I enjoyed your lead story in the last *PC*. I don't know the author, Kathleen Wunderly, so perhaps, if you do, you can pass along my thanks. This article is one of the few in the last several years that was worth reading (aside from the editor's comments).

The real reason for this letter is a suggestion that WU30 put together a packet for philatelic writers and publishers. The article mentioned above might make a great start in this endeavor.

As interviewed, Gini Horn makes a lot of good points (along with the usual librarian's demand that one does everything her way or else).

More important, there are good reasons given why things should be done this way or that. Some of the points make sense but are not really that important, like bimonthlies that overlap years, but other points such as numbering are very important and most editors have little or no guidance in this area.

I personally wish that I had been able to read this great article before I started my old newsletter, for it

would have left less room for the "literature judges" to nitpick, and might have forced more vigorous arguments than I was able to get started on my own. □

From Herman Herst Jr.: There have been mentions lately in the paper about a publication called *The Southern Philatelist*. I think that members ought to know a little about it.

It was started by a retired medical doctor, George Twomey, who had told me over a period of 20 years that he would love to edit a stamp magazine. When he retired from medicine he had enough money to start a magazine and asked if I would help him.

He lived in Fort Myers, Florida, and I suggested the name *Southern Philatelist*. August Dietz was still alive and I wrote and asked him if he had any objection to the name being used in a new publication. He said he would feel flattered.

Twomey told me that he didn't hope to make any money on the publication, he just wanted to be an editor, and he had a grand time. He lost a fortune, but it was with absolute pleasure.

The expense of putting it out was more than mailing and printing but it didn't bother him at all. He didn't last long, and when he died the name was picked up from his estate by Robert Knobel, who was running a stamp organization based on a publication that he wanted to run.

He took *The Southern Philatelist* over as his own, but didn't run it for very long as he went broke with the society and with the paper.

It is not often that someone starts a magazine hoping to lose money and doing it just for the pleasure, but that was Twomey's idea and he achieved it. When his circulation was discussed as it has been in *The Philatelic Communicator*, perhaps this foot note ought to be recorded.

Thanks to George Griffenhagen for sending along a copy of *The Philatelic Communicator* to replace the one I lost. I was halfway through it when it disappeared and it ruined my weekend not being able to finish it.

It is one of the most readable periodicals in the stamp field and my compliments to all who contribute to it, including George and Ken Lawrence. □

From Ken Lawrence: In doing research for a column, I discovered an odd twist on the practice George Griffenhagen complained about in his letter last issue: recycled articles whose earlier publication is not acknowledged.

The revered Philip H. Ward Jr. did this frequently as he moved his column from one stamp paper to another over the course of a long career. Toward the end, almost nothing that appeared under his byline was new.

One of his articles, first published in 1935 (I believe; at least I couldn't find an earlier appearance), contained a serious mistake about a unique and legendary U.S. philatelic treasure. It should have been a major embarrassment for him just to have had it appear one time, but every few years Ward reused the same column verbatim.

Each time, someone would write a letter noting the mistake, and a few weeks later Ward would respond with a different excuse.

On a different subject, Calvet M. Hahn's letter in our last issue merits a few comments. If Cal were a member of APS and WU30, he would have been spared the embarrassment that publication of his letter must have caused him.

The letter read like a movie review whose author took in just the closing scene and the credits. Anyone who has a nodding acquaintance with my writing knows my opinions are at the opposite pole to his accusation.

Whatever opinion one may hold of Cal's scholarship, no one is likely to extol his writing as a stylist's model for courtesy. I recall that I once characterized him as philately's unhappiest writer, so I doubt anyone would troll his writings for gems of humor, either.

Irony, however, is a mood one ought to be able to read before one tries to write it. □

From Alan Warren to Joseph Lelyveld, Managing Editor, *The New York Times*: I was shocked to read in yesterday's [December 5, 1993] Sunday edition that the Stamps, Coins, and Camera columns have been summarily dismissed. Hobbies are a welcome relief from the stressful environment we live in, and I looked forward to these columns in the Sunday edition as a respite from the space devoted to news of street violence and world tensions.

I particularly feel that eliminating the Stamps column is ill-advised. I have been a regular reader of this column since the days of David Lidman. Barth Healey's refreshing approach to the hobby, with his insight that informed the veteran collector as well as attracted newcomers to the hobby, set an example for hobby columnists.

I urge *The New York Times* to reconsider this decision and to restore, at the very least, the Stamps column to its rightful place in the pages of your newspaper. □

From William Borders, News Editor, *The New York Times*, to Alan Warren: Thank you for your comments about the changes we have made in *Styles of The Times*. I am sorry that our decision to drop some of the columns has distressed you.

We don't like upsetting any of our readers, and it would be nice if we could only add to our mix and never have to subtract.

But all sections of *The Times* undergo continual re-evaluation by the editors to determine the most effective use of staff and space, balancing the needs of features with those of basic news coverage.

Sometimes this review results in the creation or expansion of departments, as in the recent doubling of space for articles in *The Times Magazine*. In the case of *Styles*, it resulted in a decision to redeploy some resources, and cut back on some columns.

As we review *Styles* in the future, we will take your views into consideration. And your evident concern for *The Times*, and loyalty to it, mean a great deal to us. □

REVIEW

A Caribbean Neptune: and first, the good news . . .

By Charles J. Peterson

A Caribbean Neptune: The Maritime Postal Communications of the Greater and Lesser Antilles in the 19th Century by Robert G. Stone. Published 1993 by The Philatelic Foundation, New York. ISBN 0-911989-22-6. Hardbound, 7¼ by 10¼ inches, offset, xxi + 357 pages, well illustrated, maps, bibliography, printing limited to 750 copies. Exclusive distributor Leonard H. Hartmann, P.O. Box 36006, Louisville, KY 40233, \$65 postpaid.

There's probably no one who knows the postal history of the Caribbean, in all its aspects, as well as Bob Stone. He already gave us an intensive study of the postal history of the Danish West Indies.

Now, 24 years later, he focuses on the local and foreign maritime mails serving St. Thomas, Puerto Rico, and Cuba, from Spanish colonial mail beginning in the mid-1800s to the British, French, U.S., and German services up to the close of the 19th century.

The book is crammed with data: listings and illustrations of postal markings, sailing schedules, lists of vessels, postal rate tables, inventories of known covers over individual lines. There are copious illustrations of covers, and a generous supply of maps.

This is the result of a lifetime of study and assembling of data, and it's a magnificent treasure trove of information for anyone interested in the Caribbean and transatlantic mails.

That's the good news. The bad news involves what was done to the manuscript—and what should have been done, but wasn't.

The most obvious problem is the printing: boldface headers so black and shiny that they're "in your face" ugly, against a body type so weakly printed that most of the letters appear broken, on a paper of insufficient weight.

Less apparent, until one begins to use the book, is the *laissez faire* quality of the editing, which does the author and the book a grievous disservice.

Those who have known Bob (and that includes the book's publishers and editor) recognize that he assembled and wrote in terms of chapters and sections, rather than in terms of a comprehensive and well-integrated book, and he did so over the course of decades. Thus the manuscript at any given time contained considerable redundancies and loose ends, which he at least occasionally resolved to his own satisfaction by including references to other sections and chapters.

Given the state of Bob's health in recent years, it should have been clear that the onus of turning the manuscript into a cohesive publication would fall on the editor. Unfortunately, that responsibility wasn't met, as some randomly selected examples will indicate:

The front matter includes a list of "basic references,"

while the more extensive "general references" at the rear include special notation of "those references we consider basic"—but the two lists of "basics" aren't identical.

For no apparent reason, several of the chapters and even a few sections end with their own short lists of "references"; and these also deviate in part from the general bibliography. Citations in many instances are incomplete and/or inconsistent and in some cases faulty.

The illustrations of covers are appropriate to the general subject, but seem very much an afterthought, with no integration with the text. Instead, there's an eight-page contents list of illustrations.

As the author explains, "the numbered sequence of figures does not correspond with the sequence of topics in the text. The figures are presented so they can be considered separately from the text, and the captions are sufficiently explicit so that a survey of the figures alone will give an overview of this book's content. . . ."

Frankly, that's a weak excuse for a failure to plan the illustrations concurrently with the text, and a good editor should have jumped on it. It's a problem that could have been corrected, particularly given the resources of the Philatelic Foundation.

Editing includes checking illustrations against captions, and both against the text. The differing appearance of the two YNDIAS Type B markings on facing pages 38 and 39, plus the deviation from the type chart on page 35, should have raised a red flag.

A check of the original source (Camino), as cited by Stone, results in a significantly different characterization of the physical features than shown in Stone's Figure 5-6, suggesting a possible error of attribution, or possibly a poor job of strengthening the marking for reproduction. In any case, it varies to a large enough extent to warrant comment.

Contrary to logic, the two facing maps at pages 50-51 show the *second* (Leeward Islands) monthly packet routes on the left, and the *first* (Jamaica) monthly packet on the right; these are followed immediately at pages 52-53 by maps of the *Jamaica Packet* (left) and *Leeward Islands Packet* (right). So maybe the original source (Britnor) had them that way for some reason; that's no reason to perpetuate the inconsistency in this new publication.

And saddest of all, there's not a shred of index. That, at least, would have been the redeeming feature that could pull together the separate text and illustration.

In general, the more complex the subject, the higher the incidence of place and proper name duplication in different chapters, the greater the interrelationship of one part of the story with others, the more the work is intended to serve as a basic reference, so much greater the need for an index.

Yes, it's a good book, and I decidedly recommend it if you have an interest in the field . . . but when you read it, consider for a moment how much better it could and should have been. □

Literature Awards

The Hafnia '94 Literature Exhibition

By Charles J. Peterson

The Event Itself: Some Innovations

Hafnia '94, which took place in Copenhagen, Denmark, from January 27 through 30, 1994, was the third specialized international literature exhibition held under the auspices of the Federation Internationale de Philatelie (FIP). It was an enjoyable and interesting show from many perspectives.

One of the more innovative aspects of the event was the fact that it was held in conjunction with "Vacation '94," this year's edition of Denmark's annual winter showcase for tourism, travel, and vacation activities.

It featured everything from foreign tourist board booths to artist's supplies, and included such crowd pleasers as strolling entertainers, a display of glass blowing, and samples of French food.

The philatelic section occupied a relatively small corner of the exhibition hall, with the literature entries, 54 Mophila ("modern philately") exhibits of three to five frames each, 25 one-frame non-competitive entries from top collectors and five Court of Honor one-framers, plus an "open class" of 30 entries devoted in some manner to the theme of vacations, or travel, or both.

Add to this a number of dealers' booths, 12 postal administration offices, several philatelic society tables, and a reading room that included several hundred selected literature items from the library of the Copenhagen Philatelic Club in addition to copies of the literature class entries.

The Danish PTT furnished several static displays, and there was also a Junior Corner (including a large plastic wading pool about eight inches deep in stamps, in which toddlers could play!).

Even though the Bella Center exhibition hall was almost a half-hour bus trip from the center of Copenhagen, and there was an entry fee for the show, the place was packed each day. I'd estimate at least 50,000 visitors, and I'm being very conservative. *And most of those visitors ended up visiting the philatelic section*—whether or not stamps may have been among the attractions that brought them to the Bella Center.

Even on Friday morning (early on a work day), there was a continual stream of visitors to the frames and the reading room. (And since the exhibition hall is well supplied with places to sit and rest, over and above the tables adjacent to the food and drink vendors, the reading room crowd was intent on checking out the literature, not merely in taking the load off their feet.)

Of course, one of the impulses that drew non-philatelists as well as seasoned collectors to the frames was to mark their ballots for the Mophila entries (the winner of this class being decided by popular vote).

►►

The Danish PTT gave the voting a special incentive, by holding a drawing from the ballots in which the prize was a two-week vacation in Paris. No wonder that there were well over 20,000 votes to count, based on the final day's estimate!

This type of combined event can't help but be good for philatelic literature, and for philately in general. It made the exhibition financially possible, and attracted and involved an enormous number of potential new collectors.

Medal Results

The Hafnia '94 exhibition showcased 322 philatelic literature entries, from 37 countries. As could be expected, approximately one-third came from the Nordic countries, with about 100 from English-speaking countries and 120 from the rest of the world.

In keeping with that breakdown, the nine full jury members and three apprentices were split into three teams for the primary round of judging, with the entire jury assembling for final review and consensus.

(I consider my command of English to be reasonably good, and I've got a fair reading ability in the Scandinavian languages even if it's hard to work my tag lines

from the Norwegian version of "Three Billy Goats Gruff" into normal conversation. Naturally, I ended up on the "rest of the world" team!)

The judges tended to be tough. While I felt a few results may have been on the high end, most of the calls were on the low side. In some cases, that made a one-level difference in the final medal result. Although that may make for a few unhappy repeat exhibitors, it reflects (in my opinion) a good breakdown of the entries into their appropriate medal-level peer groups.

Two Large Gold medals were awarded. One went to the Grand Prize winner (and Best in Class for the handbook class), *The Postal Services of the British Nigeria Region*, a monumental work by Jack Ince and John Sacher. The second, with a Special Prize, was awarded to Jane and Michael Moubray's *British Letter Mail to Overseas Destinations 1840-1875*.

Both are Royal Philatelic Society, London, imprints. The Royal also took honors in the periodicals class, with a Gold medal and Best in Class award going to the *London Philatelist*.

American and Canadian entries results are as follows:

Gold: Eugene A. Garrett, *A Postal History of the Japanese Occupation of the Philippines 1942-1945* (with Special Prize);

Large Vermeil: Dr. Harvey Karlen, *Chicago's Crabgrass Communities*; Bill Welch, *The American Philatelist*; **Vermeil:** Leonard Hartmann, *United States Letter Rates to Foreign Destinations 1847 to GPU-UPS* (author: Charles Starnes); David G. Phillips Publishing Co., *U.S. Stampless Cover Catalog*, Vol. III (with Special Prize for Best in Class); Peter P. McCann, *British Caribbean Philatelic Journal* (Michel Forand, Canada, ed.); Peter P. McCann, *The Congress Book 1993* (Michel Forand, Canada, ed.); Bill Welch, *Philatelic Literature Review*;

Large Silver: Leonard Hartmann, *The Handstamps of Wells, Fargo & Co.*, 2nd ed. (author: John F. Leutinger); Bernard Hennig, *German Submarine Mail World War I*; Mark Maestroni, *Journal of Sport Philately*; Harlan F. Stone, ed., *Postal History Journal*;

Silver: American Air Mail Society, *Via Airmail*; Scandinavian Philatelic Foundation, *AFA Specialized Catalog 1987-*

1988: Sections on Slesvig and Slesvig-Holstein, Greenland Postal History, Denmark Christian X, Denmark Postal Labels, Denmark Essays and Proofs; Hal Vogel, "A Doubly Extraordinary Polar Expedition"; Scandinavian Collectors Club, *The Posthorn* (Gene Lesney & John Lindholm, eds.); Michael Nowlan, *Articles in Canadian Stamp News—"Philatelic Bookshelf"* (Canada) (with Special Prize for Best in Class); David V. Tilton, "Stamps";

Silver Bronze: Peter K. Iber, *Revenue Stamps of Thailand*; Thomas Mazza, *Postal Markings on Stampless Mail from Warren County, Pennsylvania and Postal Markings on Stampless Mail from Erie County, Pennsylvania*; Willy Melberg, *SCC 1993 Library Index*; Harlan F. Stone, ed., *PhilITex '92* publications; F.R. Stubens, ed., *The Mediterranean Mails* (Canada); Bill Brooks, *Forerunners*; Paul Burega, *Philography Canada* (Canada); Arthur A. Dumont, *Ice Cap News*; Leo Martyn, *Postal Himal*; Carl LeMar John, *Mexicana* (Edward M. Nissen, ed.);

Bronze: Stefan Danielski and Dr. Miet A. Kamienski, "Austro-Hungarian

Gunboat Mail on the Vistula 1914-1918" (Canadian); J.J. Danielski, *Litauische Zensurmerkmale im 2. Weltkrieg—Eine Bestandsaufnahme und Litauische Zensurmerkmale im 2. Weltkrieg—Nochmals zu den handschriftlichen Vermerken* (Canadian); James N. Demos, *Spectacular Greek Rarities: The Inverted Centers of 1927*; Paul Hennefield, *Gay & Lesbian History on Stamps: Handbook—1992 Achilles to Zeus*; Hal Vogel, *Postal History of the International Transarctic Expedition 1989-90*; Federico A. Brid & James B. Helme, "Panama: The 1885 Stampless Period"; Kathy Ward, ed., *Yule Log* (Canada); Ernst M. Cohn, "Postal History Comments/Postgeschichtliche Betrachtungen";

Certificate of Participation: Paul Hennefield, "The Birth of the Gay & Lesbian Philatelic Society"; Peter Iber and Mary Ann Owens, *The Exhibitor* (Bangkok '93);

Non-Competitive (Official Class): Robert Odenweller, with the FIP *Guide to Exhibiting and Judging Traditional Philately and Postal History Exhibits*. □

Healey Wins Lidman Prize for Second Time

Barth Healey, stamp columnist for *The New York Times*, was awarded the 1993 Lidman Prize for excellence in philatelic writing in non-philatelic publications.

The 1993 competition was the seventh annual contest sponsored by the Council of Philatelic Organizations in an effort to recognize and encourage writing about the stamp-collecting hobby in publications read by the general public.

Healey previously won the Lidman Prize in 1988,

its second year of competition. According to the rules of the contest he was ineligible to compete for three subsequent years. The judges' selection of Healey's columns as the prizewinner turned out to be ironic, as the *Times* recently discontinued his biweekly column, along with other hobby and recreational features in the newspaper.

It also is ironic that the Lidman Prize itself honors a former *Times* stamp columnist, the late David Lidman, who covered stamps for that newspaper from 1960 to 1973. He died in 1982.

Healey received his award during the Sarasota National Stamp Exhibition 1994. The Lidman Prize consists of \$500 in cash, an engraved plaque, and an expense-paid trip to the award site.

Other awards in the 1993 Lidman competition were:

Category 1 (Regular newspaper column, circulation under 100,000).

Richard A. Colberg, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, silver,
Robert H. Frederick, Elyria, Ohio, silver.

Category 2 (regular newspaper column, circulation more than 100,000).

Edward J. Davis Jr., Providence, Rhode Island, gold,
John E. Foxworth Jr., West Bloomfield, Michigan, silver with
felicitations;

Fred Greene, Dallas, Texas, gold,
Barth Healey, New York, New York, gold.

Category 3 (article in magazine, circulation less than 50,000).

Randolph E. Schmid, Alexandria, Virginia, *Weatherwise*
magazine, bronze.

Category 5 (all other).

Herman Herst Jr., Boca Raton, Florida, miscellaneous
columns, bronze,

Ken Lawrence, State College, Pennsylvania, stamp section
in *Colliers International* year book and *Funk & Wagnalls New*
Encyclopedia Yearbook, bronze.

The 1993 Lidman Prize judges were philatelic author and
editor John Hotchner, philatelic judge and exhibitor and author
Patricia Stilwell Walker, and Jeanne Cooper, editor of the
Weekend section of *The Washington Post*. □

Peterson Awarded Danish Medal

In January 1994, the Copenhagen Philatelic Club (KPK) of Denmark presented the society's medal to Charles J. Peterson, President of the International Philatelic Federation's Commission for Philatelic Literature, for "his outstanding promotion of philatelic literature."

The KPK was founded in 1887 and is one of the leading philatelic societies in Scandinavia. The medal, established in 1926, is the highest award of the society, and is issued for exceptional philatelic accomplishments. Peterson becomes the 31st recipient, and one of only nine living holders of the award. □

►► Catalog, from page 1.

Curiosity having gotten the better of me, I set aside the covers with interesting cachets and soon had more to research than to sell. That was the genesis of a file that eventually resulted in a publication titled the *USCS Naval Cover Cachet Makers' Catalog*.

Walter G. Crosby, retired Navy chief petty officer, was one of the very early naval cover cachet makers. Starting in 1929, Crosby began sponsoring covers with thermographed and printed navy ship, holiday, or patriotic cachets. In the next decade, he was quickly followed by literally hundreds of members of the USCS, ANCS (American Naval Cancellation Society), and other specialty philatelic societies who tried their collective hands at drawing, servicing, or sponsoring cacheted naval covers.

About 1935, cover society officials, sufficiently concerned with sponsor reliability, formed a council to register cachet makers. As long as they operated in a responsible manner, registered cachet directors (RCD) were able to advertise in the various philatelic publications of the time.

John Haag, a council member, also organized an annual competition to select a annual King and Queen of Cachets from among the best ten designs of the year. Truly, the 1930s was the golden era of naval cover cachets and, I felt, an effort must be made to catalog pertinent information while it was still available.

Many naval cover artists and sponsors identified their work with their names or initials, but an equal number identified their products with only an ANCS, USCS, AIGLON (National AIGLON Society), ICG (International Cover Guild), or RCD number. It was these numbers that led me on a quest to supply a name for each and every cachet identified only by a society number.

Searching through back issues of the *USCS Log*, *ANCS Navigator*, and assorted membership directories, I was able to assemble a substantial file on three-by-five cards with corresponding names and society numbers.

My first thought was to publish a cross index so that others could easily identify a name from covers that contained only a society number identification. Then I decided it might be more useful also to include a short biography of the artist or sponsor much as Dr. Earl Planty and Mike Mellone had done for the first day stamp catalogs being issued at that time.

And so, at the annual meeting of the USCS Board of Directors, I submitted several sample pages of my proposal and asked if the USCS would be willing to sponsor such a project. Surprisingly, for this was principally a postmark collectors society, I received unanimous approval. The directors present also suggested information that they thought should be included in order to document the work of naval cover cachet makers adequately.

The next year or two were spent in research, assembling files on individuals, and making copies or procuring covers for a master file. I spent hours going through dealers' boxes at stamp shows looking at both the front and reverse of a cacheted envelope for identity clues.

If a needed cover was reasonably priced, I bought it for the file; if expensive, I took notes that I later transcribed to three-by-five cards. At a subsequent annual USCS Board meeting, I circulated a sample chapter of the catalog and, along with some minor comments, received final approval of the format.

Cacheted naval covers exist by the hundreds of thousands. An attempt to catalog each and every cachet would be mission impossible.

Cachets were drawn and serviced for construction events, shakedown training, port visits, holidays, exercises, anniversaries. ►►

saries, and changes of command, to mention but the most popular subjects. Multi-purpose cachets were sold to individuals who preferred to service their own covers. Cachets using standard printers' cuts were recycled with different legends.

In numerous cases, the same or nearly identical cachet was used on any number of ships and on many dates over a period of weeks, months, or even years. So, a listing by ship or chronologically made little sense.

The most logical arrangement, we had decided, would be alphabetical by cachet maker, individual, or group. Because of the scope of the project, I later decided to list cachets sponsored by some 100 USCS chapters and over two dozen ANCS crews as separate appendices.

Another decision on arrangement, jointly made, was how to incorporate illustrations in the catalog. Ideally, we should show samples of the work of each cachet maker along with the text. However, I knew that the first edition of the catalog could not possibly hope to include every cachet maker—there were just too many makers who had drawn or sponsored a small number of covers to be known the first time around.

Coupling illustrations and text would require a total redo of the catalog for later editions, so we agreed that the illustrations would be collated in a separate section at the end of each chapter. While this was not the best possible arrangement, it was, for this catalog, the most practical.

It was also understood that it would be impractical to attempt to illustrate 100 percent of the work of each cachet maker. Rather, enough examples would be shown to illustrate the "style" or breadth of coverage of each maker.

Up to this point my research had covered, at most, the first 20 years of naval cover cachet makers. A close friend and associate in the USCS offered to help gather information on modern cachet makers.

Together we developed a simple two-page questionnaire, which my friend mailed to cachet makers still living. As word of our project circulated in the society, members offered suggestions and more questionnaires were sent. Response to our questionnaire was excellent and I was able to build on my file of early makers.

Fortunately, at this time word processors began to appear in some quantity in businesses. The company I worked for sprang for a word processor for both our project secretary and our procurement group.

I learned to use these wonderful machines and spent many a lunch hour and weekend afternoon compiling data on diskette. The beauty of this arrangement, of course, was that I could change or correct information or include a newly discovered maker without laboriously having to retype the balance of the chapter.

By the 1984 USCS convention in Reno, Nevada, I had completed the cross index and the first nine chapters, text, and illustrations of the work. Actually, the illustrations for chapters eight and nine were the masters since I did not quite have enough time to make copies of those particular pages. I carried my manuscript to Reno proudly to show the directors at the scheduled Saturday Board meeting.

My wife and I checked into our hotel Thursday, ready for the festivities.

Friday morning, I discovered that the shower knobs were not operating and asked the desk clerk to have them repaired. No problem, he said, we'll just give you another room and so we moved.

I placed my manuscript and several albums of covers I had brought to sell or trade in a cardboard carton on the top shelf of the closet. That evening, we walked with friends to a well-known restaurant for dinner.

Several hours later, back in the room, what to my disbelieving eyes should appear but a blank space in the closet where the cardboard box had been. It turned out that mine and the rooms of two other USCS members had been burgled during the dinner hour. Nothing was ever recovered, but thank God for APS insurance.

If you own a computer, three words of caution—backup, backup, backup—constitute the most oft-given advice to new users. The fact that I had my manuscript saved on diskette is the only thing that kept me from simply giving up the entire project after the theft. To recover, I had only to reprint the text and to reassemble the illustration pages for chapters eight and nine, a minor annoyance.

The basic format for each maker included society membership numbers, occupation (if known), type and years of activity, and a description of the type of cachets drawn, serviced, or sponsored. As the catalog progressed, I decided to include a checklist of cachets produced or sponsored for all cachet artists or sponsors on whom I had a substantial file.

I made up a list of event covers from my file and then circulated the list to other members who I knew or suspected had covers by these makers. After one or more iterations, I usually was able to build a representative, often nearly complete, listing for many makers. The checklists proved to be one of the most popular features of the catalog.

One thing users generally expect to see in a catalog is item pricing. For this catalog, that also was deemed to be mission impossible. The value of a cacheted cover is not just in the cachet; type of cachet, maker, event, ship type, postmark type, and clarity and condition of envelope all are multipliers.

Rarity is a factor common to both the postmark and cachet, and I included quantity information (number of cachets produced) to the extent that was known or could reasonably be estimated.

It took nearly two more years to complete the entire catalog from A to Z, at which point it was decision time—how many copies to print, where to have them printed, and how much to charge.

With a membership of nearly 1,500, we estimated that an initial printing of 500 copies should be a supply sufficient for several years. We submitted a copy to several printers and fortunately found one (since out of business) who did volume printing at a cost much below other quotes. Printing cost was about \$12 per catalog, so we set the sale price at \$27.50 postpaid, netting the society an amount equal to the unit cost.

The first edition of the catalog comprised nearly 600 pages of text and illustrations of 950 individuals and groups (not including USCS Chapters and ANCS Crews) who had sponsored cachets for naval covers since 1930.

Pages were looseleaf, 8-1/2 by 11 inches, and punched for a standard three-ring binder.

Following the Table of Contents, indexes were provided for USCS, ANCS, RCD, AIGLON, ICG and WSCNCC (Western Stamp Collector Naval Cover Club) by society number cross referencing the cachet maker. Then follow chapters in alphabetical order listing each maker alphabetically within the chapter. Illustrations followed the text in each chapter but, since pages were looseleaf, users could organize them as they wished.

The catalog was very well received by society members, dealers, and others interested in cachets. Several favorable reviews boosted sales beyond our expectations and we actually ended up reprinting the catalog much sooner than we had anticipated. Clearly, the catalog filled a need both inside and outside the USCS.

The catalog was advertised with the full acknowledgment that the first edition did not or could not possibly identify all naval cover cachet makers. Not only did this not deter members from buying the catalog, but, in fact, it spurred many to send information on unlisted makers and/or photo copies of examples needed for the illustration sections.

In the years since the catalog was issued, I have amassed a thick file of new makers and additional information that will be included in the second edition. The demand for a second edition is there, all that I need is time to do the job.

The USCS is currently in process of a major revision of its postmark catalog, a listing of over 50,000 postmarks used by thousands of naval ships over the last 85 years. Here again, a discussion of some of our thinking may help others who may face a similarly daunting task.

First, some background:

For the past 30 years, the postmark catalog was the purview of one member who brooked little interference with his work. Chapters, organized alphabetically, were reviewed in order and updated one at a time, with the chapter master typeset and corrected, then copies printed and issued, a lengthy process.

When the editor decided to retire several years ago, nearly half the catalog was considerably behind times, some chapters as much as 20 years.

The very first step was to bring the project into this century. The entire volume was scanned (flatbed HP ScanJet) to hard drive for later transfer to IBM compatible diskettes. Finally, data could be added, deleted, and manipulated with relative ease. Next step was to find a replacement editor.

In its wildest dreams, the Board of Directors knew it would be unable to find a volunteer to carry on this effort, so we decided to split the editorial work into manageable sections. Four individuals did step forward to edit portions of the catalog and one more volunteered to direct and coordinate the project. Ultimately, two of the editors failed to perform and were replaced by one other volunteer and the coordinator.

At the same time, a Classification Committee was appointed to resolve a number of issues that had been smoldering. Members were invited to submit suggestions and, as a result, the new catalog will be issued on 8-1/2-by-11-inch pages instead of the 5-1/2-by-8-1/2-inch size favored by the previous editor.

The revised edition will also include cancels eschewed by the previous editor as philatelic in nature. Current philosophy is for a complete enumeration of postmarks in the classic definition of a catalog.

One of the editors had suggested that we transfer the entire file to database format, so that selected portions of the catalog could be printed on request. While it would be nice to be able to offer a catalog of, say, only battleship or fancy cancels, we decided against that complexity.

Our volunteer editors were not exactly computer whizzes. In fact, one was a novice, so we decided to KISS—keep it simple, stupid. Our data files are typed in word processing software, mostly *WordPerfect 5.0* or similar so data entry is

easy and straightforward. However, we may offer the revised catalog on diskette to those members who want just to use and print selected portions of the catalog.

The USCS *Log* is prepared by desktop editing using Ventura Publisher, so we decided to stick with the same software to produce the revised catalog. The coordinating editor drew up guidelines to standardize entries, remarks, and notes as well as instructions for applying the necessary "tags" to entries so that the word processed text will automatically be formatted in Ventura.

Members were asked to send photocopies of postmarks missing from the current catalog. We've had good response, but not to the extent hoped for. Not unexpectedly, the project is moving slower than we would wish, but it is definitely progressing.

As individual alphabetical chapters are completed, they are sent to a review group to check for errors or omissions and to double check or assign rarity codes. About ten years ago, the USCS changed from pricing individual postmarks to letter codes in eight levels indicating quantity from common to rare. We have no central system for tracking postmarked cover prices and even a periodic updating of catalog prices would be simply overwhelming.

That about ends my tale on producing or revising philatelic catalogs. Perhaps some advice might tie it all together.

- If you are contemplating a new catalog, check with other society members to see if they agree it is needed. There's no use in doing a lot of work for nothing.

- For both new and revised catalogs, ask other society members what information or format will best suit their needs. Iron out the small details up front.

- Ask others for information and help, but don't expect to be overwhelmed by the response.

- Don't even think about such a project without having access to a computer and a desktop publishing program.

- Backup, backup, backup.

- Line up at least one, preferably two or three others to proof read your finished draft; plan on one more iteration after the proofreaders have bled all over your work.

- Last, but certainly not least, either keep your finished manuscript in a burglar-proof safe or leave it in plain sight on a table or desk so that a thief will not think it has any intrinsic value. □

►► Jaffer, from page 1.

that arcane information was so important, as well as by the writers, who learned that they don't always understand what they're being told.

Perhaps the most notable instance occurred when James Tolbert, with unquestionable sincerity, indicated that Stamp Management found no measurable value in plate number information—in fact, there were only three or four writers who ever requested it. Therefore, there's no reason for the USPS to expend resources to gather, collate, and disseminate such data, particularly in a time of reduced budgets.

Tolbert was immediately challenged on his assumptions. In the first place, the BIA, *Scott's Specialized*, *Linn's Yearbook* and the several PNC journals serve as publications of record for plate number data, and those are the sources the vast majority of collectors use; the number of authors requesting and publishing that information has no relation to

►►

the "importance" of plate number information to the collecting world. Second, USPS stamp marketing policy obviously recognizes and cultivates the interest in plate numbers, as George Griffenhagen quickly demonstrated with specific catalog listings from the most recent USPS *Stamps etc.* The addition of plate numbers to coil stamps—which Stamp Management says meets no USPS needs—has in fact increased the retention factor from two (a line pair) to five (PNC). From the standpoint of profitability, Stamp Management should be encouraging the dissemination of plate number data, rather than withholding it.

At the same time, postal officials were able to explain some of the problems and legitimate constraints involved in processing raw production figures into releasable information, forcing the writers to reexamine and modify some of their own assumptions.

As a result, one of the most tangible achievements of the conference was the resolve to make plate number data available for all publicly announced stamps, as soon as procedures can be set up for collation and dissemination. (Which refers to very practical concerns, and is not simply Washingtonese for "pie in the sky by and by.")

Other specific improvements included arrangements for more direct contact with public information offices at stamp printers; open channels to Stamp Services personnel on technical matters; more timely release of art work. Additionally, Jaffer looked at this meeting as one of a series of USPS/philatelic writer discussions, several per year, preferably to be held in conjunction with major philatelic events; I'll get together with him before the end of February for a joint assessment of the meeting, agreement on what was promised, preparation of an informal memo for the participants, and tentative plans on subsequent activities. You'll undoubtedly read details in the weekly stamp press before this article reaches you.

All in all, it was a good meeting—in particular for the closer understanding, over and above the tangible results. Does that mean that all problems will go away, and that the philatelic press and the USPS will go hand in hand into a rosy future? Not likely, since there's a natural (and desirable) degree of tension between the press and public institutions . . . but it does suggest that many of the unnecessary barriers of the past few years will be removed and the general flow of philatelic information will be improved. □

►► Secretary-Treasurer's Report, from Page 24.

1728 **James A. Klinger**, P.O. Box 751, Chesapeake City, MD 21915-0751. Editor: *Possessions Journal* (U. S. Possessions Philatelic Society); and editor: *Guam Stamp Club Bulletin*. Sponsor: Robert Rawlins.

1729 **A. Gordon Colley III**, 2515 Commonwealth Drive, Charlottesville, VA 22901. Sponsor: Michael Lawrence.

1730 **George Saqqal**, 571 Ninth Street, Brooklyn, NY 11215. Author: *Postal Administrations of the World*; columnist, *The Log* (Universal Ship Cancellation Society). Sponsor: George Griffenhagen.

1731 **Jack Harwood**, P.O. Box 32015, Sarasota, FL 34239. Editor: *North American Newsletter of the Postal Order Society*; columnist: *Postal Order News*. Sponsor: Ken Martin.

1732 **William A. Sandrik**, P.O. Box 3277, Arlington, VA 22203. Associate editor: *La Posta*; contributor to *Pratique* (Disinfected Mail Study Circle). Sponsor: Charles Peterson.

1733 **Richard A. Leiby Jr.**, 2340 Fairview Street, Allentown, PA 18104-6555. Editor: *Pennsylvania Postal Historian* (Pennsylvania Postal History Society). Sponsor: Charles Peterson.

1734 **John L. Puzine**, 431 South Street, Reading, MA 01867-4003. Editor: *Bermuda Post* (Bermuda Collectors Society). Sponsor: Michel Forand.

1735 **Richard Joseph Nazar**, 34 Nottingham Way, Somerset, NJ 08873-4911. Editor: *Plate Number Coil Catalog*. Sponsor: Charles Peterson.

1736 **Leo Martyn**, P.O. Box 49263, Los Angeles, CA 90049-0263. Editor: *Postal Himal* (Nepal & Tibet Philatelic Study Circle). Sponsor: George Griffenhagen.

1737 **Lloyd Richard Lotz Sr.**, 506 Hillside Lane, Louisville, KY 40207-2171. Editor: *Stamp Chatter* (Louisville Stamp Society). Sponsor: John Hotchner.

1738 **Wayne L. Youngblood**, 658 North Ohio, Sidney, OH 45365. Editor: *Scott Stamp Monthly*. Sponsor: Several members.

1739 **Roger G. Schnell**, 4800 NE 20th Terrace, Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33308. Free-lance writer. Sponsor: Charles Peterson.

Changes of Address

0811 **John A. Kircher**, 6429 Annapolis Drive, NE, Albuquerque, NM 87111-1235.

1332 **Peter Mosiondz**, P.O. Box 1483, Bellmawr, NJ 08099-5483.

1457 **William B. Robinson**, P.O. Box 12492, Green Bay, WI 54307.

1477 **Martin Margulis**, 4159 Steck Avenue #113H, Austin, TX 78759-8511.

1512 **Terrence Hines**, P.O. Box 629, Chappaqua, NY 10570-0629.

1526 **John R. Gilgis**, P.O. Box 3207, Fayville, MA 01745-0207.

1531 **Bernice A. Scholl**, P.O. Box 522579, Marathon Shores, FL 33052-2579.

1653 **Marc Lambert**, 752 Haight Avenue, Alameda, CA 94501.

1662 **Alvin Kantor**, 401 100 Avenue NE #205, Bellevue, WA 98004.

1667 **Jeanne H. Zonay**, 10392 110th Avenue North, Largo, FL 34643.

1687 **Steven M. Roth**, 1280 21st Street, N.W., # 209, Washington, DC 20036.

Deceased

0038 **George M. Martin**, Yakima, WA.

0965 **A. Ben-David**, Downsview, Ontario, Canada.

Reinstatement

1691 **Howard L. Lucas**, 3602 North Fairfield Lane, Dale City, VA 22193, who writes to your editor: "Thank you for your reply to my July 25, 1993, letter concerning my resignation. Please reinstate my membership."

Resignations

0265 **C. E. Foster**, Albuquerque, NM.

0269 **G. J. Raymond**, Houston, TX.

1275 **L. I. Kindler**, Philadelphia, PA.

1318 **C. M. Teeman**, Rockford, IL.

1384 **D. Speirs**, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

1437 **W. F. Robinow**, Munich, Germany.

1450 **R. B. Jordan**, Fresno, CA.

- 1509 P. J. Ryan Sr., Universal City, TX.
 1523 T. E. Maeder, San Pedro, CA.
 1610 G. Kelly, Diessenhofen, Switzerland.
 1619 J. J. Norton, Syosset, NY.
 1668 G. D. Murray, Charlottetown, PE, Canada.

Delinquent Members

These WU30 members have not paid their 1994 membership dues as of March 15, 1994. This will be the last issue of *The Philatelic Communicator* they will receive unless their dues are received by the time the next issue is mailed.

- 1636 Brian Birch, Wigan, England.
 1579 Jan Brandewie, Sidney, OH.
 1608 Paul Burega, Ontario, Canada.
 1612 Peter Bylen, Westchester, IL.
 1674 John Campbell, Auckland, New Zealand.
 0104 Herbert Conway, New Hyde Park, NY.
 1379 David Cooper, Grand Portage, MN.
 0201 Edna Cummins, Red Bluff, CA.
 0013 James T. DeVoss, State College, PA.
 0016 Belmont Faries, Livingston, MT.
 1661 Jeffrey Forster, Mount Serano, CA.
 1442 Eli Grad, Wellesley Hills, MA.
 1282 Jack Haefeli, Albany, NY.
 1483 Herbert Herman, Sunrise, FL.
 1679 David Jickling, Washington, DC.
 1557 Richard Kalnins, Ridgefield, CT.
 1696 Bernice Killough, Conestoga, PA.
 1576 Gary Kurylo, Northville, MI.
 1349 Graham Locke, Quebec, Canada.
 1493 Edwin McGee, Lakeview, OH.
 1446 Laurence McInnis, Quebec, Canada.
 1616 Frank Moertl, Hartland, WI.
 1588 Barry Newton, Fairlawn, OH.
 1551 Stephen Olson, Foster City, CA.
 1494 Micahel Orsenstein, Northridge, CA.
 1671 W. A. Reeves, Surrey, England.
 1478 Ian Robertson, Toronto, Canada.
 0420 Pedro Rodribuez, Miami, FL.
 1600 Stephen Schumann, Hayward, CA.
 1586 L. G. Sheno, Bangalore, India.
 0779 Demaris Smith, Memphis, TN.
 1680 Peter Smith, Ann Arbor, MI.
 1630 Steve Thorning, Elora, OH.
 1635 Gene Trinks, Troy, MI.
 1643 Carolyn Weber, Oxnard, CA.

Contributions

We thank these WU30 members for including a supplemental contribution with their 1994 dues:

- 0078 Barbara R. Mueller, Jefferson, WI.
 0113 Charles J. Peterson, Laurel, MD.
 0859 Carl A. Kilgas, Pacific Palisades, CA.
 0943 William Thomas Lockard, Wellston, OH.
 1511 Robert D. Rawlins, Healdsburg, CA.

Comments

These comments accompanied 1994 dues payments (or their resignation) from WU30 members:

"I am still very pleased with *The Philatelic Communicator* which gives me more information than the quarterly of the worldwide AIJP." Albert Boerma, The Netherlands.

"I tried your magazine for three years and it is not worth

the membership dues. Too much mud slinging." Gene Kelly, Switzerland.

"Digging up scandal is not for *PC*, which seems to have lost its way. Therefore, I decline to renew my membership." Dale Speirs, Calgary, Canada.

"No matter what I do, I cannot raise the medal level of my journal, so I feel that I am not getting out of the Unit what I expected." P. J. Ryan Sr., Universal City, TX.

"Perhaps you could arrange for someone in Great Britain to collect all (WU30) dues from UK members and send you a single check for all. This would be a saving to all of us in the UK because bank drafts in U.S. dollars are very expensive." Ronald Spafford, UK.

"Would it be possible for the Writers Unit and APS membership dues to be sent together? A bank draft costs \$10, and I fear that sending cash to both societies will get 'lost' in the post office." R. G. Darge, West Midland, West Australia.

Secretary-Treasurer's Note: Any *overseas* member of both APS and WU30 can send payment for both APS and WU30 dues with *both* membership notices to *either* APS or WU30. Each will see that the other organization receives their share of the payment.

Keep Your Mailing Address Current

Please notify me of address changes to assure receipt of *The Philatelic Communicator* without delay or missed issues.

George Griffenhagen, Secretary-Treasurer, WU30
 2501 Drexel Street
 Vienna, VA 22180

Last Words

By Joe F. Frye

George Martin's passing struck me a cruel blow when I first learned of it as I opened Ken Lawrence's packet of copy for this issue the afternoon of March 12, 1994. I am, and philately certainly is, diminished by this loss.

In the last issue I noted [Indent] (F4 in *WordPerfect 5.1*) was best used instead of [Tab]. That change—on the beginning of the second line in a paragraph, the first line being started with a [Tab], will prevent the program reshuffling indented second and following lines "indented" with [Tab] in paragraphs such as those used in our Literature Awards articles. But I didn't elaborate.

[Tab] before the start of the first line in a paragraph gives the desired "indent," as you see in these paragraphs. It is satisfactory for normal open text where the second and subsequent lines in a paragraph are *not* to be indented.

Where second and subsequent lines in a paragraph are to be indented, and the first line is *not*, the *second* line in such a paragraph should begin with [Indent], and that and all other lines in that paragraph will be indented. If a paragraph begins with [Indent], all lines in it will be indented one tab stop.

My apology for my failure to elaborate. I hope none of you has jumped in and used your Search-and-Replace command to replace all tabs with indents. If you have, un-Search-and-Replace, please.

I remembered to correct this on Saturday, March 5, 1994, over a week before beginning the preparation of this issue. As I make this final edit to take it to the printer tomorrow, March 17, I have not heard from anyone about my sin of omission and commission.

Even "rabbit tracks" don't anger me. Write me too! □

The Philatelic Communicator
2501 Drexel Street
Vienna, VA 22180
Address Correction Requested

BULK RATE
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID AT
MEMPHIS TN
PERMIT 957

TO:

Secretary-Treasurer's Report (As of March 15, 1994)
Writers Unit Breakfast

The next APS Writers Unit 30 Breakfast will be held at 8:30 a.m., Sunday, August 21, 1994, at the Pittsburgh Vista Hotel, Pittsburgh, PA, during the STaMpsHOW 94, 108th APS annual convention August 18-21, 1994. Breakfast tickets are \$14.00 per person, and should be reserved by contacting Daniel G. Asmus, APS, P.O. Box 8000, State College, PA 16803. Telephone (814) 237-3803; FAX (814) 237-6128.

Welcome to the 21 new members received since our last report of December 8, 1993.

1719 David R. Torre, P.O. Box 4298, Santa Rosa, CA 95402. Free-lance author: *American Revenuer*. Sponsor: Ken Lawrence.

1720 Connie Totten-Oldham, P.O. Box 45043, Washington, DC 20026-5043. U.S. Postal Service. Sponsor: Charles Peterson.

1721 Jonathan Toopper, P.O. Box 610002, Houston, TX 77208-0002. Editor: *Houston Philatelic Society Newsletter*. Sponsor: George Griffenhagen.

1722 Michael L. Baadke, 327 West Parkwood Street, Sidney, OH 45365. Associate Editor: *Linn's Stamp News*. Sponsor: Steven Rod.

1723 Barry K. Ellis, 5117 Arrowhead Pass, Fort Wayne, IN 46804. Publicity Chairman: American First Day Cover Society. Sponsor: Alan Warren.

1724 Katherine H. Foster, 4113 Paint Rock Drive, Austin, TX 78731-1320. Editor: *Texas Precancels* (Texas Precancel Club). Sponsor: Jane King Fohn.

1725 Ralph E. Trimble, Box 26556, Markville P.O., Markham, Ontario, Canada L3R 0M4. Editor: *Newsletter* (Canadian Re-entry Study Group of BNAPS). Sponsor: Charles Peterson.

1726 Brian C. Baur, 420 East 25th Street, Chicago Heights, IL 60411-4317. Author: *Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Stamps of the United States 1933-45* (Linn's Stamp News, 1994); regular contributor: *Stamp Collector*. Sponsor: George Griffenhagen.

1727 Bill Charles Gompel, P.O. Box 872, Florence, AL 35631. Free-lance writer: *Bermuda Post* (Bermuda Collectors Society). Sponsor: George Griffenhagen.

►► Secretary-Treasurer, Page 22.

Table of Contents

Deadline	2
Features	
President's Message	3
George M. Martin	4
Literature Exhibition Calendar	2
Procedures for No-Fee WU30 Critique Service	4
Editor's Bulletin Board	5
Last Words	23
Secretary-Treasurer's Report	24
Articles	
So, You Want to Do a Philatelic Catalog? ...	1
Jaffer Delivers as Promised	1
Literature Judging Advisory	4
Perspectives on Judging: A Symposium ...	6
Is Our System of Judging Fair?	6
Mixed Fruit	8
Philatex '92 Judging Re-Revisited	9
Writers Wanted	10
Nordic Journal Celebrates Centennial	11
Auction Catalogs as Literature	12
Letters From:	
Michel Forand	13
Robert de Violini	14
E. E. Fricks	14
Mark H. Winnegrad	14
Herman Herst Jr.	15
Ken Lawrence	15
Kenneth T. Stewart	15
Alan Warren	16
William Borders	16
Review	
A Caribbean Neptune	16
Literature Awards	
Hafnia '94	17
Lidman Prize	18
Peterson Awarded Danish Medal	19

Don't forget!
Second Quarter Deadline
April 20, 1994